

John H. Dimond to be postmaster at Manchester Center, Vt., in place of J. H. Dimond. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1931.

Leon F. Merrill to be postmaster at Norwich, Vt., in place of R. C. Olds. Incumbent's commission expired March 6, 1930.

VIRGINIA

Baxter W. Mock to be postmaster at Damascus, Va., in place of B. W. Mock. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Nellie D. Swan to be postmaster at Gordonsville, Va., in place of N. D. Swan. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

Elton H. Finks to be postmaster at Somerset, Va., in place of E. H. Finks. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, Almighty God, that the merciful gates of Thy love stand open day and night. Our Father, we earnestly seek deliverance from the slave of selfishness and from the passionate prey of evil desire, that we may bring honor to our station and give full proof of our high estate. Throughout our land subdue unjust criticism, and in our hearts may we raise the high anthem of a nation's worth and pride, bearing loyalty and fidelity to our Christian institutions. Bring us all into concord with the fine and patriotic hopes and aspirations of the sons and daughters of toil. O may we labor, may we dream, may we long, and may we grasp the breadth, the length, the depth, and the height of the divine plan. In the name of the Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 46

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 18,000 additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement relative to the facts as to enforcement, the benefits, and the abuses under prohibition laws of the United States, of which 12,000 copies shall be for the use of the House, 4,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies for the document room of the House, and 1,000 copies for the document room of the Senate.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this is a unanimous report from his committee, all the members attending?

Mr. BEERS. There is only one member of the committee who is here at this time, so it is unanimous.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. STEVENSON, is on that committee?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And as I understand, he is not in the city?

Mr. BEERS. No.

Mr. GARNER. What is to be the cost of this printing?

Mr. BEERS. \$1,080.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand by the phrase "12,000 copies shall be for the use of the House" that the 12,000 copies will be distributed through the folding room?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. So it is not necessary to incorporate the words "to be distributed through the folding room"?

Mr. BEERS. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. This will give the Members of the House how many copies each?

Mr. BEERS. Twenty-seven copies each, and 1,000 copies will be placed in the document room.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the gentleman's committee considered the publication of the Fish report on communism also, so that we may have some copies of that report?

Mr. BEERS. No; we have not.

Mr. EDWARDS. That matter has not come before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BEERS. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BEERS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman considered at all the printing of the voluminous testimony that was taken by the commission?

Mr. BEERS. This is a resolution for printing the report of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. And now I am seeking information as to whether anything has been presented to the gentleman's committee with respect to printing the testimony that is supposed to support this report.

Mr. BEERS. There has not been anything presented to the committee.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, Judge Kenyon said the testimony was secret and also stated that it was very valuable and instructive, and further stated the public would never know what was in that testimony until we had a congressional investigation. I have introduced a resolution to that effect this morning.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was hopeful the testimony would be available to the Members of the House, so we could see on what they based their inconsistent report.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is secret.

Mr. CRAMTON. Am I to understand that my colleague is disappointed in the report?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am very much disappointed in the fact that they did not have the courage to follow out their convictions. They admit the law is not enforceable, but these doctrinaires did not have the courage to follow their convictions to a logical conclusion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD submitted the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WASON, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, submitted a report on the bill (H. R. 16415, Rept. No. 2320) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. BYRNS reserved all points of order.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House be per-

mitted to sit during sessions of the House while hearing House Joint Resolution 101 and kindred resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, asks unanimous consent that that committee may be permitted to sit during sessions of the House for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 101 and other kindred resolutions. Is there objection?

Mr. STOBBS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

UNIFORM ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL PARKS

The Clerk called the committees, and when the Committee on the Public Lands was reached—

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 196) to provide for uniform administration of the national parks by the United States Department of the Interior, and for other purposes, on the House Calendar.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or other authorization for the prospecting, development, or utilization of the mineral resources within the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., or the Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., shall be granted or made.

SEC. 2. That hereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to prescribe regulations for the surface use of any mineral-land locations already made or that may hereafter be made within the boundaries of Mount McKinley National Park, in the Territory of Alaska, and he may require registration of all prospectors and miners who enter the park: *Provided*, That no resident of the United States who is qualified under the mining laws of the United States applicable to Alaska shall be denied entrance to the park for the purpose of prospecting or mining.

SEC. 3. That hereafter no permit, license, lease, or other authorization for the use of land within the Glacier National Park, Mont., or the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., for the erection and maintenance of summer homes or cottages shall be granted or made: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, renew any permit, license, lease, or other authorization for such purpose heretofore granted or made.

SEC. 4. That hereafter the acquisition of rights of way for steam or electric railways, automobile or wagon roads, within the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., under filings or proceedings under laws applicable to the acquisition of such rights over or upon the national-forest lands of the United States is prohibited.

SEC. 5. That hereafter the acquisition of rights of way through the valleys of the north and middle forks of the Flathead River for steam or electric railways in the Glacier National Park, Mont., under filings or proceedings under the laws applicable to the acquisition of such rights over or upon the unappropriated public domain of the United States is prohibited.

SEC. 6. That the provisions of the act of March 2, 1899 (30 Stat. 993), granting rights of way, under such restrictions and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may establish, to any railway or tramway company or companies for the purpose of building, constructing, and operating a railway, constructing and operating a railway or tramway line or lines, so far as the same relate to lands within the Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., are hereby repealed: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed so as to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from authorizing the use of land in said park under contract, permit, lease, or otherwise for the establishment and operation thereon of a tramway or cable line or lines for the accommodation or convenience of visitors and others.

SEC. 7. That the provision of the act of January 26, 1915 (38 Stat. 798), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and upon such conditions as he may deem wise, to grant easements or rights of way for steam, electric, or similar transportation upon or across the lands within the Rocky Mountain National Park, is hereby repealed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Utah yield?

Mr. COLTON. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention of the gentleman to make a general statement as to the bill?

Mr. COLTON. I expect to do that now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, as indicated by the title of the act, for providing for the uniform administration of the national parks. In the case of two or three of the parks, at the time they were created special provisions were made which kept them out of line, so to speak, with the general administration of the rest of the parks.

For instance, section 1 of this bill provides that hereafter no permit, license, lease, or other authorization for the prospecting, development, or utilization of the mineral resources within the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., or the Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., shall be granted or made.

When these two parks were created they were not brought under the general provisions of the laws that apply to the parks, and prospecting for certain minerals was permitted in these two parks. This bill would withhold that privilege and put these two parks on the same basis with other parks in the country.

Now, that is true of other parks affected by this bill. For instance, section 4 permits the acquisition of rights of way for steam or electric railways, automobile or wagon roads, within the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif., under filings or proceedings under laws applicable to the acquisition of such rights over or upon the national-forest lands of the United States.

There certain privileges were granted, and this would invalidate all special rights applying to this park and place it in the same class with other parks, and so on.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand, when these several national parks were created, in each case there would be some local condition prevailing that made it necessary for some sort of compromise. In one case they had to permit prospecting and in another the acquisition of rights of way.

Now the parks have been in operation for a number of years. Local conditions have changed, so that now there is a willingness that in each case the special privilege or permit may be eliminated and all parks placed on the same basis.

The operation of the parks and experience has proven that it is undesirable to have such special provisions, and also the special provisions carry an element of danger that might sometime prove an embarrassment. There is no objection to this legislation, which is to bring uniformity of administration in the various parks.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield? Of course, everyone will be in sympathy with the purpose of the bill. But what I can not understand is that a week ago, when this committee had a day, a bill was passed, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], which permitted in two counties in California doing exactly what is prohibited in section 3 of this bill.

Mr. COLTON. No; that was forest land, and the bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] had another effect. That bill provided that when special uses had been granted in the forests no other rights could attach during the lifetime of that special use.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In good, frank, honest language the purpose of the bill was to permit the building of millionaire bungalows on forest land. I regret that the bill was not opposed and I hope it will be stopped in the next body.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield? I think we ought to emphasize, and I would be glad if my friend from New York can keep the distinction in mind, for the idea may later be helpful, that the forest lands are operated on an entirely different basis from the national parks. The Forest Service has a regular system of permitting summer homes. And in the Park Service they guard against that absolutely.

Mr. COLTON. I feel sure that the gentleman from New York is mistaken as to the effect of the bill passed last week.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I see that the gentleman from California has just come into the Chamber. I have been criticizing the bill that he introduced which was passed last week and I am sorry that it passed.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will permit this further observation, in view of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] has said about the two kinds of legislation coming from one committee, I think it should be noted that the establishment of national forests and most of the legislation with reference to national forests do not come from the Public Lands Committee but from the Committee on Agriculture. Personally I think that is wrong; I think that the Public Lands Committee should have jurisdiction over all legislation affecting the national forests.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. But inasmuch as they do not, the Public Lands Committee does not have jurisdiction over the policy the gentleman is criticizing.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How in the world did it have that bill last week which was reported out?

Mr. COLTON. That bill was not a bad bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; it is a bad bill.

Mr. COLTON. The practice has been to grant special-use permits to people who may establish recreational centers, for instance, and as soon as that was done speculative prospectors would go in and locate mining claims and attempt to sell them to those who have the special-use permit. That bill was simply to stop that sort of practice in certain sections of California.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Personally I would be very glad if at this point in this discussion either the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], both of whom are eminently qualified to do so, would make a statement as to the especial differences between national forests and national parks, so far as that difference has any effect upon the granting of special permits for special uses.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are just as different as day and night. Our great aim in the national parks is to eliminate special privileges, so that the entire park area may be open for the common use of everyone, and in the national forests they have established a policy of granting a permit so that if the gentleman desires he can secure a permit to build a summer home in the national forest, sometimes in very delightful surroundings.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I have understood that, but what difference is there in the general purposes of the establishment of national forests and the establishment of national parks which makes this difference in the uses to which the land may be put as the gentleman indicates.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not desire to criticize or commend the forest policy. I do want to urge this as to national parks. It is not feasible or desirable to permit those special privileges in national parks.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In that I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, but I would like to know why national forests are so much different that special uses should be permitted in them.

Mr. COLTON. Commercial development not inconsistent with the conservation of the forests is permitted in national forests, as, for instance, the cutting and marketing of timber that is ripe and ready for market. Also, there is a good deal of land in the national forests not timbered. It is essentially grazing land. There are other large areas of land that may be used, consistent with the policy of conservation, for the purpose of recreation by the people, while the parks are entirely different. We seek in the parks to keep them free from commercial uses.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman think that the permission of those special uses tends toward the conservation of the national forests?

Mr. COLTON. I do not think it has injured them. The Forest Service is very capable.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman think it may injure them?

Mr. CRAMTON. In order that gentlemen may give some thought to the proposition, which may arise when I will not at the time have the opportunity of expressing myself here, let me say this. An incidental use of the national forests for recreational purposes is not inconsistent with their general purpose. It ought not to be the prime purpose of a national forest, however. As to their carrying on a policy of granting privileges for the building of summer homes under special permits, I have no desire now to criticize that. I have not studied it sufficiently as to national forests to justify an opinion. I make this one appeal, however. Whenever the Forest Service comes to Congress with any program for the building up of a big recreational

division in the forests, I hope the Congress will restrict the program to this extent, to see to it that the Forest Service does not carry on a recreational development with summer homes and all kinds of special permits in an area immediately adjacent to a national park, because if that be done it means a great deal of difficulty for the Park Service. Let them have their development in a different area.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Lest I be misunderstood, let me say that I am in thorough and happy accord with the purposes of the National Park Service, for which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has fought so valiantly during his service in the House. I would like to see a clearer and more specific policy established with reference to national forests.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has asked what is the essential difference between the policy of the Forest Service and the policy of the Park Service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And the reasons for that difference.

Mr. TEMPLE. If I may for a moment speak of myself, for several years I was a member of the coordinating commission, which dealt with certain matters relating to both the Park and the Forest Services, and we were compelled to visit parks and forests in the West. The precise matter the gentleman refers to was discussed very frequently by the coordinating commission.

There are more than 160,000,000 acres of national forests. They have been set apart for economic purposes, for the development of the forests, for the cutting of timber when the timber is ripe, and for other economic uses. Mining rights and grazing rights are granted in many parts of the 160,000,000 acres where trees will not grow. The recreational uses of areas in the national forests are purely incidental. On the other hand, the parks are set apart for two purposes entirely distinct from ordinary economic purposes, namely, for recreation and for the preservation of great natural scenic features as a sort of outdoor museum. Economic development within the parks would interfere with both of those purposes, while economic development within the forest is precisely in harmony with the specific purpose for which the forests are set apart.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Now, does the gentleman happen to know whether the economic development of national forests is based upon a survey and determination of the needs of the national forests themselves or whether such uses are haphazardly granted when applications come for such use?

Mr. TEMPLE. I think when applications come both the general welfare of the forests and the extent to which the granting of the application would interfere with that are weighed by the Forest Service.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I hope that is true.

Mr. TEMPLE. That is their policy.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My general impression has been that these applications have reached us only when somebody wants a special use.

Mr. TEMPLE. The application, of course, comes from people who want a special use, and I believe the Forest Service weighs the circumstances and conditions very carefully. They may sometimes make mistakes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If forest conservation is the principal interest in the matter of the granting of these uses, should not the department or a committee of Congress or some authority determine what uses should be granted, and then arrange to have those uses put into operation?

Mr. TEMPLE. The laws give to the service the right to make regulations following out certain policies, and the policies are partly developed in the service rather than in Congress, but I believe if the whole question were put before Congress, the policy in general would be approved by those who understand the situation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am very glad to have this expert opinion from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] whose experience has given him an opportunity of studying the subject. I dare say most Members of the

House have not had any greater information on the subject than myself.

Mr. TEMPLE. There is a very great difference in the area of the parks and the area of the national forests. While there were 19, there are now 22 or 23 national parks. Their combined area is small, compared with the 167,000,000 acres of national forests on the continent and in Alaska. I think there is even more than that now. These were the figures given me four or five years ago.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But I consider the Forest Service so important that I would not think of subordinating it to any other uses to which this land might be put.

Mr. COLTON. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] that the Forest Service has a very good conservation policy.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not say they have not. I am trying to get information.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. Whenever a man asks for a use permit, he makes the application to the nearest forest ranger, who, in turn, makes a personal examination, and then if it is in the interest of the public a use permit is given by the Forest Service to the applicant. These national forests are unlike the forests of the East, where you find a fence every place you go. In the national forests you or I could go into the wilderness area of the West, and if we saw a place we liked for a summer or recreation camp we could ask for a permit to build a cabin or house. In the State of Nevada nearly every high mountain productive of timber or pasturage or water conservation, every mountain that is worth while, is included within a national forest. The same thing applies to the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the west. All through California this range is to a large degree a forest reserve. There is no place where the public can go into the mountains unless this condition prevails, and if they can find a place on a little stream or in a meadow on a lake, or in a timbered section, and it is in the interest of the public, he may make application for a little home site, a little place where he can spend a couple of months in the summer. He makes application to a national forest officer and a use permit is given to him after investigation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is that permit revocable?

Mr. ARENTZ. It is from year to year. He pays \$15 a year ordinarily, and it goes from year to year.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. The gentleman knows I was at one time a forest ranger and later a forest supervisor. I know what the instructions are to the supervisors and rangers; and I know how special-use proceedings are carried on, because I have gone through with them many times. The instructions, of course, are under regulations established by the Secretary of Agriculture. He is given authority to do that by Congress. Those instructions are that all special uses and all other uses to which forest areas may be put shall be subordinate to the fundamental purposes for which the forests themselves are established, which are conservation of the forests and conservation of the water supply. Before any special-use permit is issued the forest officials in charge must give attention to what effect it will have on these primary purposes of the forests. That, I would say, is the established forest policy, and it is carried out.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] is able to give expert testimony in this matter, and I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say that I have lived right adjoining a forest reserve for 50 years, so that I know something about forest reserves. As the gentleman has said, there are some 167,000,000 acres of forest reserves in the Western States. In my State there are about 14,000,000 acres in forest reserves, extending throughout a large part of the western half of Colorado, which is my congressional district.

It is quite common for people in the forest-reserve States to go up to some scenic place adjoining some small stream in the forest reserves and camp. They get a temporary permit from the forest ranger in charge, and it does not hurt anybody. As a matter of fact, it is a very good use to make of the forest reserve. Both of the two national parks in Colorado are in my district and are affected by this bill, and I am in favor of it. It provides for a systemization of the handling of the national parks.

The first bill I ever passed when I came to Congress in 1909 was vetoed by President Taft. It was a bill to allow the local people to mine coal in the land adjacent to this Mesa Verde National Park. That coal cost nothing, while coal shipped in cost \$17 a ton. In those days the Appropriations Committee was much more accommodating than it is at the present time. I at once went to see the chairman, Mr. Tawney, of Minnesota, and he said, "I believe that bill is all right," and he just put it on as "a rider" on one of the large appropriation bills as an amendment, and it passed, so that President Taft had to sign the bill containing the exact language he had just vetoed a few days before. It was important at that time.

But thereafter the local people in that Montezuma Valley opened other coal mines and discontinued the use of that coal adjoining that park, I understand, so that law is not now operating or necessary. At least that is the information I have; and therefore I do not object to the repeal of this first Federal law I ever enacted. I may add that I had the same experience when I first entered the Colorado State Senate 34 years ago now. The first bill I passed was vetoed by Governor Adams, and I waited until the next governor came in two years thereafter and passed the same bill again, and it was signed by the governor and has been a law ever since. The provision prohibiting the building of any railroad in the Rocky Mountain National Park is all right.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is the permit renewed annually?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The forest-reserve permits? Some are and some are for longer, I think. At least the permit usually has a preference for another year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not for the rights of way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am speaking of these permits for homes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. Many of these special-use permits are issued annually, but if there is a considerable investment involved, as in the construction of a summer home, the permit may extend over a definite period of years.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There can be no claim for damages, if for some reason the permit should not be renewed and it would be necessary to move the home?

Mr. LEAVITT. No. However, the permittee is given preference in the matter of renewal; but if the decision is reached that it should not be renewed at the time it terminates, the permittee has no recourse.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I thank all gentlemen for the information I have obtained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Three or four of the sections of the bill under consideration relate to a prohibition against the granting of rights of way for railroads and the like through certain national parks. I am in hearty accord with that policy, but I wish to inquire why the gentleman could not provide for a general revocation of that authority applicable to all national parks.

Mr. COLTON. That is the general law, and it does apply to all other national parks; but an exception was made at the time of the creation of these particular parks, and the purpose of this bill is to put them in harmony with the general law applicable to all parks.

Mr. STAFFORD. So, after we pass this bill and it becomes a law, there will be no instance where rights of way for utilities will be permitted, except upon the express authority of Congress?

Mr. COLTON. That is my understanding. If there are any left I do not know of them, and the Director of the Park Service did not inform us of any.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me inquire further along that line whether there is anything in this bill which forbids the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way in the national parks for the erection of transmission lines.

Mr. COLTON. We have a general act to that effect, and we do not create parks any more unless we provide that the power act does not apply. We forbid the construction of transmission power lines through any of the parks.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOUNDARIES IN THE BRYCE CANYON NATIONAL PARK UTAH

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands, I call up the bill (H. R. 16116) to adjust the boundaries and for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16116) to adjust the boundaries and for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUCE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes a certain addition to the Bryce Canyon National Park in southern Utah. There is an area to the south of the present boundaries of the park that is practically as beautiful, unique, and inspiring as the area that is now included in the national park. This bill would extend the boundaries, in conformity with the act we passed last year, toward the south and east, along the rim of the mountain on which the Bryce Canyon National Park is located.

I think there is no objection to the bill. It has the favorable report of the Secretary of the Interior, and the committee was unanimous in making the report.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is it all public domain?

Mr. COLTON. It is all public domain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are several bills of like import on the calendar recently reported from the committee over which the gentleman has the honor to preside as chairman. I wish to inquire whether there are any other instances where the lines of a national park are jagged so that the park must be straightened? We have been increasing the area of the parks in recent years, to do away in many instances with irregular exterior boundaries. In some instances the increases have been small, but in other instances there have been extensive increases, and some of them are meritorious and others are more or less involved in doubt as far as the record shows.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one observation I would like to make.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have the opinion of the expert on national parks.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not respond to that description.

Mr. STAFFORD. Everybody else would accredit that distinction to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one observation I would like to make. There are a number of cases where the boundaries of national parks should be adjusted in important particulars, but, as the gentleman knows, oftentimes the creation of a national park is a compromise and not only local interests have to be consulted but oftentimes other branches of the Government. There has been a great deal of difficulty in adjusting matters as between the Park Service and the Forest Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit there, there is a bill on the calendar that is coming up for consideration where the Department of the Interior takes one view and the Department of Agriculture takes another. When that bill is reached I would like to have some explanation of the varying viewpoints of the two departments.

Mr. CRAMTON. The general attitude of the Forest Service for many years was one of extreme reluctance to let loose any land, however important for park development and however unessential to its own program.

I want to give the gentleman an illustration of what occurs in many cases. Take the south rim of the Grand Canyon. The Grand Canyon is one of the wonders of the world. In our conservation and use of that area the park land on the south rim is restricted to a very narrow strip, and adjacent to that is what is called a national forest, but as a national forest it does not amount to shucks. The trees there are not of any commercial importance. We ought to have a much larger area brought into the park. They are now trying to develop the wild life on the south rim, bringing deer in there, and so forth, but the deer wander over the line into the national forest and are shot. The gentleman would think it would be very easy to adjust this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would think so.

Mr. CRAMTON. We have been trying for years to adjust problems of that kind. I want to say that while the general attitude of the National Forest Service has very materially improved in the last few years, especially under Major Stuart, speaking of the Forest Service as a whole and without any criticism of Major Stuart, it still is not what it ought to be. If it were, these adjustments could be made in one omnibus bill and the subject closed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the Forest Service is antagonistic to giving up some of its preserves that rightfully belong to the National Park Service?

Mr. CRAMTON. It seems to me the question ought to be, What is the greatest use to be made of the particular area?

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the character of the soil and what is the land best adapted to?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; what is the greatest use the Government can make of it, and where it is true that its greatest use comes through the Park Service, the Forest Service ought to be willing to let loose. They are more willing than they used to be, but they are not as willing yet as they ought to be.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman recalls, I am sure, the reason the Forest Service was separated from the Department of the Interior. It happened because—I was going to say a little dispute, but that would not describe the situation. It became a national controversy as to whether Mr. Ballinger, who was then Secretary of the Interior and hailed from the State of Washington, should continue to have jurisdiction of the national forests.

Mr. Gifford Pinchot, now the Governor of Pennsylvania, was a strong conservationist and at that time was Chief Forester. The bureau was transferred during President Taft's administration to the Department of Agriculture. This condition has long since passed, and I am wondering whether the Forest Service should not be transferred back to the Department of the Interior where it rightfully belongs. It was only an expedient occasioned by political exigency that caused its transfer from the Department of

the Interior to the Department of Agriculture, and here we have to-day, as illustrated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], an instance where there is rivalry of jurisdiction, apparently, with respect to giving up their preserves, without consideration of what is for the benefit of the service.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. COLTON. There is no question but what all public lands should be under one jurisdiction.

Mr. ARENTZ. If the gentleman will permit, I receive no complaints relative to the Forestry Service except occasionally a complaint that the fees are a little bit too high or that they are a little harsh in the interest of the Government rather than the general public. Further than that, I think the Forest Service, under the Department of Agriculture, is doing a wonderful work.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not criticizing their work, but I am criticizing their narrowness in not being willing to give up some of the land under their jurisdiction to the Park Service, where the land should properly be a part of the park area. As to the argument made by the gentleman from Arizona—

Mr. ARENTZ. Not Arizona, Nevada.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; from Nevada, where they have no trees at all. They are arid there in more ways than one.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am not speaking to that point.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from the arid State of Nevada states that the Department of Agriculture should have jurisdiction over this service because it plants trees. Now, in my State we have a conservation commission that has taken jurisdiction over the park reserves and they are planting trees by the thousand and it is not within the jurisdiction of the State bureau of agriculture.

Mr. ARENTZ. The question is whether or not the Agricultural Department have done a good job.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is one of administration—whether the administration should be under one or two departments.

Mr. ARENTZ. You would not have much respect for a department if, when any other department said, "We want a part of the land under your jurisdiction," and the department said, "Oh, yes; you can have it."

Mr. STAFFORD. We ought to adopt a scientific method for the administration of the respective services in one department and not have them overlap with conflicting jurisdiction in two departments.

Mr. COLTON. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will join us in the movement to place all public lands under one jurisdiction.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will have my support in that endeavor; it was a makeshift originally and ought to be terminated now.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any member of the committee opposed to the bill? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York for one hour.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the committee which has this bill in charge is one of the most interesting committees in the House. It has jurisdiction of subject matter that comes before it which makes it one of the most important committees.

I remember in 1924 when I was not on the reservation and was elected as an independent coming back to Congress I was to be disciplined and taken off of all important committees. Then some of the leaders got together to decide what committee can we put this fellow on so that he can not do any damage. So they put me on the Committee on the Public Lands. I served for two years with that committee and it was a real liberal education. I served under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Sinott, and found the work there most interesting.

I have always taken great interest in public lands, and I know the great care that this committee takes in going over all its bills. I am sure that if this committee had had jurisdiction over the naval oil reserves this country would

have saved itself the humiliation and shame of the scandal that followed.

Sometimes Members of this House look at these bills affecting public land and the national parks, owing to their technical nature, with little consideration and throw them aside. I want to emphasize to the Members the necessity of taking great pains to study and deliberate over these bills.

We have a bill now on the Consent Calendar which I hope the distinguished gentleman will call up to-day. It is a very important bill and highly technical. I will ask the gentleman from Utah if the shale bill is on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. COLTON. It is not. There is no bill reported out by the Committee on the Public Lands of that character, and there is no bill of that character to be called up to-day.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, yes; the bill came from the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is a bill that properly belongs to the Committee on the Public Lands because the members of that committee are specially expert on such subjects, while our Naval Affairs Committee necessarily must specialize in other matters. A bill of that kind ought to have been referred to the Public Lands Committee.

Now, this bill as it is looks very innocuous. It provides for the addition of certain lands to some of our national parks.

I want to call the attention of the distinguished chairman to a letter written by Mr. Albright, the Director of our National Park Service. He has rendered great service to his country in his attention and development of the national park system. He studies every one of these propositions very carefully and there is no possibility of any bill getting by him.

By the bye, this bill is rather recent. It was introduced on January 13, 1931, and on January 17, 1931, a communication was received from the public National Park Service in the Department of the Interior, and on January 20 it was reported out and is before the House for consideration. Why, our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules would say that this shows how we expedite legislation in the House.

Mr. SNELL. I want to thank the gentleman, for this is the first time the chairman of the Committee on Rules has been referred to to-day. I should be sorry to have one day go by without being referred to. [Laughter.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I want to say that he is a good chairman, the best chairman the Committee on Rules ever had. [Applause.] He can say no with the sweetest smile of any chairman of the Rules Committee that I have ever known.

Mr. COLE. Let us keep him on the job.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, they are going to keep him on the job—there is no question about that. I am sorry the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is not here. He has been complaining about the slow progress of our legislative machinery. Here is a bill which was introduced on January 13 of this year, on which a report was received from the department on the 17th of January, which was reported to the House on the 20th of January, and is before the House for consideration to-day, the 21st.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What does the bill do?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The bill provides that for the purpose of preserving in a natural state the outstanding scenic features thereof, and for the purpose of rounding out the Bryce Canyon National Park, the President shall be and is hereby authorized—

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Before we create a national park in any other part of the country, is it necessary to have some outstanding scenic features? Is that one of the requisites for the creation of a national park?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It all depends upon the locality. In some sections of the country we have scenic features, in others we have swamps.

Mr. SNELL. Would the gentleman tell me some outstanding scenic features of the national park that it is proposed to create in southern Florida, a bill for the creation of which is to come up later in the afternoon?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That brings up a very interesting question.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Oh, I think I can tell some of the outstanding features of that. My understanding is that the idea is to raise snakes down there to catch the fruit flies so that there will be no further appropriation needed for them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That would be a very useful purpose. There might be reason for the passage of that bill, in view of the fact that we have appropriated millions of dollars to look for a fly that does not exist.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Oh, I am sure that the snakes will catch them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and I am quite sure that the Mediterranean fly is going to be cared for adequately, because the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Immigration, is an expert on all things Mediterranean, and he will give the fly his careful attention. Then if he can not obliterate it from the face of the earth, we must not forget that there is my colleague from New York, HAM FISH, and if he sets about it I am quite sure that he will be able to find some communistic tendency in the fly, and after he has an investigation in respect to it and gets through with it finally, I am quite sure that there will be no more Mediterranean fly in Florida.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. It is perfectly apparent that the gentleman from New York is talking to consume time. We have 12 or 14 bills on the calendar. The gentleman is not opposed to the bill now under consideration, I take it, but is opposed to one that may be called up later. Will the gentleman consent to an armistice? We will not take up that particular bill until all of the others have been passed; this arrangement will permit us to go ahead with the consideration of these other bills. That will probably take all or most of the afternoon.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, we can do better than that. I am charged with sometimes being brutally frank—it appears that is one of my faults. Instead of having a subterfuge about the matter, saying that that bill will not be called up until the other bills are disposed of, why not agree to not call it up at all until we can get more time to study the proposition? If the gentleman does that, I shall yield the floor right now.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. One at a time.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. COLTON. I would not want to take the full responsibility of replying to the gentleman until I see the other members of the committee, but I shall reply in a few minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I imagine that if the gentleman from Utah could assure the gentleman from New York that his committee will take up the balance of the day so that other matters can not come up before to-morrow, when the wet force will be present, he would have no more filibuster from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; that is not necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. Was it not necessary yesterday afternoon?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No. The gentleman himself took up some time yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], the leader of the wets, took 25 minutes on an unimportant matter.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In all fairness to the gentleman from Maryland, the gentleman from Texas knows that he is a

member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and takes a great deal of interest in the affairs of his committee. He has traveled all over the world, in order to make a personal inspection of these buildings we are putting up in foreign countries, it is a subject dear to him and near to his heart and he was acting in the best of good faith.

Mr. BLANTON. I gathered from his 25-minute speech that he wanted to convey to the House the idea that the two large buildings in Rome, for which we have paid \$1,200,000, are not palaces in fact as they had been called, but are mere houses. That is all that I was able to gather from his talk.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It took him perhaps 25 minutes to make that description, but I hope the gentleman will not now inject another subject into the very serious discussion we are having on public lands.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has referred to 25 minutes occupied by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] occupied only 15 minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am glad to hear that correction.

In all fairness, however, the gentleman might direct criticism to me in some of the things I said yesterday, but I am sure the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] was acting in absolute good faith.

Mr. BLANTON. I think enough of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] to know that if a filibuster were necessary for him to carry out some project he had in mind, he would filibuster. That has been my idea of the gentleman ever since I have known him, for 12 years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have learned a great deal from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in 12 years. When I first came here I did not know what a roll call was. I learned what a roll call was from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman learned that the roll could be called before the prayer, did he not?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rules of the House.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly, and that was done.

Mr. BLANTON. And that it was necessary at times to call attention to matters that were going on that should be corrected.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, I did not criticize the gentleman, so that the gentleman ought not to jump on me about such matters.

Mr. BLANTON. But the matters have been corrected and that practice ceased.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is the charge made that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] used more time than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know how much time the gentleman used.

Mr. SABATH. I hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will not maintain that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has taken up any more time than the gentleman from Texas himself.

Mr. BLANTON. That would be absolutely impossible.

Mr. SABATH. I concede that. I think that is conceded by all.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope for the sake of brevity and in the economy of time I may not be diverted from the subject matter under consideration.

I was replying to the gentleman from Texas as to the nature of this bill, and I was stating at the time when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] asked me about the scenic features—

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I thought the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR] answered the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, that was a partial answer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was a pretty good answer. I want to save all of my specialized knowledge on swamps until we come to that bill, because it may be necessary then.

Now the bill would add, after a joint recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, to said park by Executive proclamation, any or all of the following-described lands—and here is the point I am trying to make. Here is a description of the lands by metes and bounds or by description of location.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. COLTON. I have just conferred with the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN], who is the author of the bill to which the gentleman from New York is opposed, and I have her permission to say that the bill will not be called up if the filibuster is conducted no longer.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of preserving in their natural state the outstanding scenic features thereon and for the purpose of rounding out the boundary of the Bryce Canyon National Park, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon the joint recommendation of the Secretaries of Interior and of Agriculture, to add to said park by Executive proclamation any or all of the following-described lands in the State of Utah, which shall thereupon become and be a part of said park subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, to wit: South half southwest quarter section 2, south half south half section 3, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 4, east half section 8, sections 9, 10, west half section 11, west half section 14, sections 15, 16, east half northeast quarter northwest quarter, east half northwest quarter northwest quarter, north half southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter southwest quarter section 17, south half south half section 19, south half northwest quarter section 20, west half west half east half northeast quarter northeast quarter section 22, north half northwest quarter section 23, west half section 27, and north half northwest quarter section 34, township 36 south, range 3 west; lots 3 and 4, south half northwest quarter section 4, northeast quarter northeast quarter and southeast quarter southeast quarter section 8, township 37 south, range 3 west; west half east half southwest quarter section 25, unsurveyed township 36 south, range 4 west; lots 3 and 4, south half northwest quarter section 3, lots 1 and 2 and south half northeast quarter section 4, township 39 south, range 4 west, Salt Lake meridian: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall affect any valid existing claims upon the lands herein authorized to be added to the park or the rights of stockmen to continue to drive stock over the lands now under an existing stock-driveway withdrawal.

SEC. 2. That the following-described lands are hereby eliminated from the Bryce Canyon National Park and shall hereafter be included in and become a part of the Powell National Forest, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, to wit: Section 30, township 37 south, range 3 west; section 25, unsurveyed township 37 south, range 4 west, Salt Lake meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike out the letter "e" and insert the figure "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SNELL] having resumed the chair, Mr. LUCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16116) to adjust the boundaries and for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to provide for the erection of a memorial to William Howard Taft at Manila, P. I.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES ON CHEYENNE RIVER AND STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands I call up the bill (H. R. 13587) to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.," and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] calls up the bill H. R. 13587, and asks unanimous consent that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.," approved April 25, 1922, be amended so as to read as follows:

"That any homestead entryman or purchaser of Government lands within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations in North Dakota and South Dakota who is unable to make payment of purchase money due under his entry or contract of purchase as required by existing law or regulations, on application duly verified showing that he is unable to make payment as required, shall be granted an extension of time for payment of one-fourth the amount, including principal and interest, due and unpaid on his entry or purchase until the 1st day of December, 1928; the remainder to be paid in three equal installments falling due on December 1, 1929, December 1, 1931, and December 1, 1932; all such amounts to bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum until the payment dates: *Provided*, That upon failure to make complete payment of any installment the entry shall be canceled and the money paid forfeited."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That any entryman or purchaser of ceded Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian lands who is unable to make payment as required by the act of March 31, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 400), may obtain an extension of time for the payment due December 1, 1930, of the total amount of principal and interest required by that act, for one year from the date when such sum became due under the provisions of said act upon the payment of interest on the total amount involved at the rate of 5 per cent per annum: *Provided*, That such claimant for the same reason and upon making payment of interest may obtain an extension of time for one year for payment of the amount due under said act on December 1, 1931."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill simply extends the time for the making of certain payments on certain lands for two years. The first payment would be due December 1, 1930. That is extended to 1931, and the payment due in 1931 is extended to 1932.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I would like the author of the bill at this time to explain in more or less detail the necessity for the

passage of this act, because other bills are pending before Congress purporting to grant extensions of time for the payment of claims due the Government.

I am wondering whether or not we will be placed in the position of discriminating against one class of claims and in favor of another class, if there is not some outstanding reason for the passage of this bill at this time.

Mr. COLTON. The testimony before the committee disclosed that crops had been poor in that section of the country, and that the prices for crops have been low, and that it has been almost impossible for these entrymen to make their payments. We are asked to extend the time simply to accommodate a situation over which the people had no control.

Mr. HARE. I think that condition prevails in many other sections.

Mr. COLTON. I think we ought to extend the time for payments to the Government to other sections, too.

Mr. HARE. I am glad to hear the chairman of the committee, who is always very fair and generous, express himself in that way; but it appears to me that unless it can be shown that some emergency has arisen by which these people are unable to make these payments we should not go ahead and by this act suspend payments for an indefinite length of time from year to year.

Mr. COLTON. The author of the bill is not present just at the moment but will be here very soon. If the gentleman prefers, we can call this bill up a little later and by unanimous consent go to the consideration of another bill.

Mr. HARE. I will be very glad to have that done.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, the author of this bill is temporarily absent from the Chamber, but he will be here in a few moments. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be laid aside temporarily and that we may return to it in a few minutes, and that in the meantime we take up another bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside the bill now under consideration, H. R. 13587. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TO RESERVE FOR PUBLIC USE CERTAIN ISLANDS ALONG THE SEACOAST OF ORANGE COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands I call up the bill (H. R. 11968) to reserve for public use scenic rocks, pinnacles, reefs, and small islands along the seacoast of Orange County, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all rocks, pinnacles, reefs, and islands having an area at ordinary high tide of less than 2 acres, and located in the Pacific Ocean within 1 mile of the coast of Orange County, Calif., be, and the same are hereby, withdrawn from all form of settlement, location, sale, or entry, in the interest of preserving the same for park, scenic, and other public purposes.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "withdrawn from all form of settlement, location, sale, or entry" and insert the word "reserved."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "purposes," insert the words "and no patent shall issue for any of said rocks, pinnacles, reefs, or islands under any law relating to the public lands after the passage of this act."

Amend the title.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The thought arose in my mind when I was giving consideration to this bill as to whether it would be acceptable to the State of California to have the title to these rocks, pinnacles, reefs, or islands transferred to that State. The basis for that inquiry is that some years back the title to a number of islands in northern Wisconsin lakes, on which no entry had been made, was transferred to the State of Wisconsin. Here we are only withdrawing these islands from settlement as a part of the public domain. The gentleman from California is unquestionably acquainted

with the character of the islands, and I ask him whether it is feasible to transfer the title to these islands to the State of California for park purposes so that they may be conserved for such purposes.

Mr. SWING. As far as the end to be attained is concerned, it would be accomplished in either way. I am in doubt as to whether or not the State could accept title without an act of the legislature. Since the same result is to be attained in either way, and the only purpose of the bill is to preserve them against speculative entry, I hope the gentleman will not press the proposal. These rocks are as much a part of the scenery at that place as the sunset, the ocean, or the curving coast line. They are enjoyed by everybody in a public way, and the only purpose of this bill is to simply keep them for the enjoyment of everybody. However, under the gentleman's proposal, I fear it would be necessary to go to the State legislature and get an act passed to accept the title, just like we have to pass an act of Congress to accept title to private property. Therefore I hope the gentleman will not object, because it would just result in additional work and delay desirable action by Congress at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the thought that these islands shall be used as a sort of preserve?

Mr. SWING. They would continue to be used in the way they have been used for the past 100 years. The first and most important thing is to preserve them as scenery. We do not want some one to get private title to them and put up billboards advertising some breakfast food. We do not want somebody to put up a hot-dog stand and sell wiener-wursts to swimmers who may go out to these islands. We do not want them to fall into the hands of private persons who might charge a fee of the fishermen who come out to fish off of these rocks. We want them preserved as they have been preserved for 100 years—for public use. Most of these islands are less than an acre in extent, and it was felt that they could not be filed upon, but now it is learned that it is possible to file upon them by script, and for that reason we want some legislation passed which will maintain the public character of them for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public in the future as has been the case in the past.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many are there in this group which will come under the purview of this bill?

Mr. SWING. I suppose, counting all of the big ones and those that are under water at high tide, there are probably 100 or 150, varying in size, varying in formation, and varying in their scenic beauty. Some of them are very interesting in figure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Within what range of distance from the shore and running laterally?

Mr. SWING. In the bill the withdrawal is limited to 1 mile from the shore line.

Mr. STAFFORD. And for what length of distance?

Mr. SWING. The length is Orange County, a distance of about 30 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any islands beyond the 1-mile limit?

Mr. SWING. There are, out at a greater distance; but those islands are islands of considerable importance and do not fall within the description given here.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there are no jetties of land jutting out of the ocean beyond Orange County on either side?

Mr. SWING. No; these are practically all rock and there is very little soil on any of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. So they will not require any supervision by the national authorities?

Mr. SWING. None at all; no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall not press my suggestion.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Do these pinnacles, reefs, and small islands now belong to the Federal Government?

Mr. SWING. Yes; the title is in the United States Government.

Mr. HARE. How many people or how many residents do we find on these properties at present, and how would they be affected?

Mr. SWING. There are no owners. There are some people who are seeking to acquire title to them by scrip and it is for the purpose of preserving their public character that this bill is being pushed.

Mr. HARE. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that some had already acquired title to some of these properties.

Mr. SWING. I was referring to some large islands that are out a distance, a number of miles, from the coast.

Mr. HARE. I notice in line 8 that they are reserved "in the interest of preserving the same for park, scenic, and other public purposes." Would that require or entail any expense on the part of the Government?

Mr. SWING. Not a nickel. The word "park" is used in its larger sense. Some of them are picnic grounds and people go out in sailboats and take their lunch and eat their lunch on some of the larger of these islands. In no sense is it intended to use the word "park" in the sense of a national park. The word "park" could be stricken out and all of the uses served just the same.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, they are now used by the public.

Mr. SWING. By the public; yes.

Mr. HARE. And the gentleman wants to protect that use by preventing anyone from getting possession or getting title to any of this property.

Mr. SWING. That is the sole purpose of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, CHEYENNE RIVER AND STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent now to return to the bill (H. R. 13587) to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak.," the consideration of which was passed over a few moments ago. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON] is now in the Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was under consideration a few moments ago the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] propounded certain questions, and I am wondering if the gentleman is ready to continue.

Mr. HARE. Yes; the question in my mind is with respect to the necessity for extending the time of payment on these lands. Is this necessity any greater than that prevailing throughout the country generally?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Of course, I do not know the conditions prevailing throughout the country generally, but I do know that in the area where this land is located, upon the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, we have passed through a period of drought during the summer of 1930, and unprecedented low prices for farm products.

There are several hundred settlers upon the Cheyenne River and the Standing Rock Indian Reservations who homesteaded these lands or purchased them at public-land sales. They have made a number of payments and there are but two payments left, one due December 1, 1930, and the last payment due on December 1, 1931.

What the bill seeks to do is to step these payments forward one year by their paying interest upon the deferred payments in advance for that period at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

There is no question at all about the need, and unless they get this extension it is certain that hundreds of these entries and purchases will be canceled and the amounts that the settlers have paid will be forfeited. Most of them have paid two-thirds or three-fourths of the total amount due and

have only a small portion of it left to be paid, but the conditions are such that they can not now pay the taxes on the land, if any were levied, much less meet installments.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman explain to the House about how much rainfall they had there during 1929 and 1930?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I could not tell the gentleman the amount of rainfall; probably 8 or 10 inches.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman ought to know that in order to show the House whether there is an emergency. Of course, I understand the gentleman would not represent a thing that was not true.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. We did not attempt to lay a foundation for establishing an emergency by calculating the rainfall. I have petitions signed by thousands of people on the reservations in both Dewey and Corson Counties. Most of the signatures are by people who owe nothing, but who want their neighbors to have a chance.

Mr. HARE. But we not only have thousands but hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of people in other sections of the country setting forth the same reasons for extension of payments on farm mortgages, and in both cases the money is directly or indirectly due the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. But that is not before the House at the present time. If that question were before the House now, I am sure it would receive consideration.

Mr. HARE. But the question is whether the House should go ahead and take an attitude toward one section of the country or one class of farmers, and then take a different attitude toward another section and another class of farmers who are in the same position for exactly the same reason.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I may say to the gentleman that it has been the practice of this Congress, as long as there have been homestead entries upon which payments were required, to grant extensions of payments from time to time when conditions were such that the homesteaders could not pay. This is not setting a precedent.

We are only asking to have the payments pushed ahead one year. When the money is paid it goes into the tribal fund and lies in the Treasury drawing 3 per cent interest. Only the interest is distributed to the Indians. The principal fund can not be paid to them, except by specific authorization of Congress, and there is ample money to their credit to care for all requirements.

Nobody opposes it; nobody will be damaged. It is an accommodation of the same character as a bank might extend were it in the Government's place. The Indians will get 2 per cent more out of the deferred payments than they would if the money were paid into the Treasury. They are that much ahead.

Mr. HARE. If I felt that the Congress was going to assume the same attitude toward other farmers I would not object, but without that assurance I feel that I shall have to vote against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE ACCEPTANCE OF A TRACT OF LAND ADJOINING HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK, ARK.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I call up the bill (H. R. 13249) to authorize the acceptance of a tract of land adjoining Hot Springs National Park, Ark., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion and upon submission of

evidence of title satisfactory to him, to accept on behalf of the United States of America that certain tract of land adjoining the Hot Springs National Park, Ark., described as being a part of the north half southwest quarter section 27, township 2 south, range 19 west, west of the ninety-third meridian, in Garland County, Ark., and which has been tendered to the United States of America as a donation and as an addition to the said Hot Springs National Park: *Provided*, That such land when accepted by the Secretary of the Interior shall be and remain a part of the Hot Springs National Park.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I see no objection whatever to this bill, but I rise to inquire how large the Hot Springs National Park is, and whether there are not certain rights owned by private individuals? I know that the bill following seeks to give the Government control over the former site of the Arlington Hotel.

Mr. GLOVER. I do not know how large the National Hot Springs Park is, but it is not large. This will add to it 63 acres.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many persons have private rights within the borders of the park?

Mr. GLOVER. No one has any private rights. There is a dump on the side, and that adjoins this property. This bill authorizes the department to accept this 63 acres which has been tendered as a donation by Col. John R. Fordyce. Under the law they can not accept donations outside of the park boundaries. This is outside, and this will be a very valuable addition to the park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE RETENTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF A SITE WITHIN THE HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK OF LAND FORMERLY OCCUPIED BY THE ARLINGTON HOTEL

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I call up the bill (H. R. 15867) to provide for the retention by the United States of a site within the Hot Springs National Park formerly occupied by the Arlington Hotel and Bathhouse, for park and landscape purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the site within the Hot Springs National Park fronting on Central Avenue and on Fountain Street, leased by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the authority of the act of August 24, 1912, to the Arlington Hotel Co., and occupied by the hotel and bathhouse building of said company until it burned on April 5, 1923, shall upon the expiration on March 6, 1932, of the existing lease therefor with the said Arlington Hotel Co., be kept, retained, and maintained by the United States for park and landscaping purposes; and no new lease shall be granted by the Secretary of the Interior for the erection of another hotel, bathhouse, or other structure thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS FROM ENTRY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE WATERSHED FOR LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands I call up the bill (H. R. 11969) to authorize the withdrawal of certain public lands from entry under the homestead and desert land laws of the United States for the protection of the watershed supplying water to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves the title to 800,000 acres of public land, and I think it better to consider it in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the land described in this bill is all in my district. I would not be in favor of the withdrawal of it from entry if there was any reasonable hope of its being used for the settlement and the development of a community. I would be the first one to advocate the growth and development of a community in my district if there were any reasonable probability of it being done on this land. The valley in which this land is situated is the present source of supply of domestic water for the growing city of Los Angeles. In 1912 they came to Congress and got a right of way to build an aqueduct; and going up into this territory they captured the Owens River, which at that time was running into a sink, evaporating and leaving merely salt and soda behind. As the city grew it was found necessary to purchase additional water rights, which the city did. They have now arrived at a situation where the city of Los Angeles owns 83 per cent of all the farm land in that community. The unfortunate effect of this, of course, is that it has stopped the growth of the villages and towns that were dependent upon the agricultural community for their prosperity. The citizens in this valley feel that Los Angeles ought to complete the purchase of all privately owned land, at their just and fair value, since it is admitted that she needs the water and must have it, rather than have half of a community remaining there without a proper supporting area around it. A solution of that problem has been finally worked out in an agreement between the people of the valley and the city of Los Angeles, and the city is now committed to the proposal of buying all of the privately owned land in that community. It recently voted bonds and is beginning to purchase the remaining private lands.

Since it is known that the city is committed to this policy there has been a growing activity of filing upon the surrounding lands which for 50 years nobody ever considered of any agricultural value, but because beneath those lands there may percolate water the ownership of the lands or the possession under a legal right under an application to enter would give a basis for complaint and a claim for damages or an injunction against the city of Los Angeles pumping water from underneath the ground in the lower basin and taking it out through their aqueduct to the city of Los Angeles. I think the city has been fair in the matter by committing itself to the policy of purchasing all of the privately owned lands.

We want the city to go through with that policy. They have agreed to do it, but now they are faced with a number of entries upon a lot of vacant, open land, worthless for agriculture but profitable for lawsuits, and as a result the city may find herself faced with a growing and unlimited obligation to purchase more lands than it may not be able to find money to buy.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What is the total acreage in this withdrawal?

Mr. SWING. Three hundred and sixty-seven thousand acres. The withdrawal is only from those forms of entry for which the land is obviously unsuited, and that is the declaration not only of the General Land Office after a field survey of all the land but is the opinion held by the Indian Service, which has also investigated the matter, because it owned 66,000 acres there on which it has tried its best for 17 years to have the Paiute Indians live. The Indians were unable to find a living on those 66,000 acres, and although the Government offered them the 66,000 acres as a gift, there is not a Paiute Indian to-day who is willing to live on that land.

This bill reserves the right for mining, for which the land is primarily valuable, for grazing, for which it is valuable, and for hunting and fishing, as many people go into that area for that purpose. I trust there will be no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall, some years ago there were discussions on the floor of the House as to Los Angeles getting its water from some other district besides that in this bill.

Mr. SWING. The city of Los Angeles is one of 11 cities in the metropolitan water district that are engaged in attempting to get an additional water supply from the Colorado River at the present time, but that is a supply which is needed in addition to the supply which they now have.

Mr. STAFFORD. My memory is rather vague as to what legislation was pending before the House at the time, but, as I recall now, there was some opposition on the part of municipalities that came from a certain district near Los Angeles, and which was the district from which they were getting their water supply, to allowing the city of Los Angeles to receive certain rights. Is this the district referred to?

Mr. SWING. I think perhaps this is the district referred to. My constituents had to go to rather extreme limits to call the city's attention to the injuries which they were suffering. Even dynamite was used, and I do not approve of that, of course, but they almost had civil war over this matter. They have now reached a settlement and the city of Los Angeles has undertaken to do the fair thing and to pay reparation, and buy all of the privately owned land from those who are willing to sell it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand it, all of these small municipalities and settlements in this valley entirely approve of the withdrawal of this great amount of acreage from public settlement.

Mr. SWING. I have in my possession, and I present it to the committee, letters from the Chambers of Commerce of Bishop, of Lone Pine, of Big Pine, and of Independence. Those are the communities involved. Also letters from the board of supervisors, and they admit that Los Angeles is entitled to protection against these speculative entries, but they do want Los Angeles to complete the purchase of the bona fide settlers who have been there a great many years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. What action has the municipality of Los Angeles taken toward following out that policy and giving evidence of good faith that they intend to consummate it?

Mr. SWING. They have sold \$38,000,000 worth of bonds. They have set aside about \$6,000,000 for the purpose of buying the lands in the towns, and \$6,660,000 for purchase of the remaining farms and water rights; \$7,000,000 for the purchase of lands in Mono County and the extension and development of the water system in that county. I take their word for it. I believe they mean what they say when they say they intend to follow out the policy to which they have agreed at the earliest possible date.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman follow up that idea so as to give us a picture as to when they do purchase these rights, whether it is going to be public land without any settlements at all?

Mr. SWING. For more than 50 years the lands described in this bill have been without settlement. They ought never to be settled. If they are left open it is an implied invitation on the part of the Government to honest, bona fide people to come in and settle there. Afterwards they find out it is a snare and a delusion; that they can not make a living on the land.

Mr. STAFFORD. I agree that we should not allow speculators to go in there and exploit the city of Los Angeles, but what I am concerned about is whether those who are there to-day are going to be adequately protected in their rights if we withdraw these lands from settlement.

Mr. SWING. I believe they will be adequately protected. I have the assurance of the city of Los Angeles to that effect. They have taken official action. That action has

had support by the overwhelming vote of the people, and I have every reason to believe it will be carried out to its completion.

Mr. STAFFORD. But have they done that in any formal way?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. By contract or ordinance agreeing to purchase those rights—property rights of settlers who have gone in there in good faith?

Mr. SWING. They are now sitting down around the table and are buying the private lands as fast as they and the owners can reach an agreement as to the price.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] has again expired.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California five additional minutes.

Mr. EVANS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I yield.

Mr. EVANS of California. That includes private homes, private properties, buildings, and all, in these various towns that the gentleman has enumerated, in his valley; namely, Bishop, Independence, and all of those cities, does it not?

Mr. SWING. It includes every bit of private property, unimproved city lots, city lots with buildings on them, any property the people say they want to sell the city of Los Angeles has agreed to buy it at its fair value.

Mr. EVANS of California. And the city of Los Angeles is buying and paying the actual value of those properties, even the buildings?

Mr. SWING. Absolutely.

Mr. EVANS of California. Not being able to use anything at all except the water that is under the ground there?

Mr. SWING. The understanding is that they are doing it in order to establish a proper feeling between the community and the city of Los Angeles. They want them to feel the city of Los Angeles has done the right thing. The city of Los Angeles wants the good will of these people.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I yield.

Mr. YON. This is the bill on which hearings were held on Saturday?

Mr. SWING. Yes, sir.

Mr. YON. I did not get to attend the committee meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. SWING. We had hearings on two different days.

Mr. YON. I did not happen to be there when the bill was reported, and I did not get full information as to this situation. Do I understand that in Mono Valley, the Owens Valley country, it is provided in this bill to purchase the property of everybody, from Mono down to Owens Lake?

Mr. SWING. Everybody who wants to sell out.

Mr. YON. Are there any communities or villages or towns of any size in this area?

Mr. SWING. Yes. The city of Bishop is a city of 1,200 or 1,500, but those people want to sell out. Their grievance in the past has been that the city of Los Angeles has been unwilling to buy the city lots. The city of Los Angeles has now committed itself not only to buying the water-bearing lots, but also to buy all of the cities as well. That has established a harmonious feeling between the two.

Mr. YON. Does the city of Los Angeles propose to buy out those communities—lock, stock, and barrel—and decimate this area of population?

Mr. SWING. The purchase of the lands in the cities will not turn it back to desert. We who know the situation know that the cities will continue. Either the city of Los Angeles will give them long-term leases or will sell them back title, with a reservation as to water rights. Thereafter those towns and villages will continue to exist as a base from which tourists, hunters, and fishermen will go in pack trains into the Sierras for hunting, fishing, and recreational purposes.

Mr. YON. What about the water rights of those settlers who live there?

Mr. SWING. There will be domestic water; and that is what they are interested in, of course.

Mr. YON. Their water supply does not detract or take from the available supply of the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. SWING. It would be insignificant.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Is it the gentleman's idea that this bill will enable the bona fide owners to take care of their rights and give to the city of Los Angeles the water rights which it needs?

Mr. SWING. That will be the exact result of this bill, and that is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I have recently received a circular from a society in California objecting to this bill, and, among other things, it was stated that the city of Los Angeles had not taken proper steps to develop the upper part of the valley; that if those steps had been taken there would be no need of depriving these people of their homes. What does the gentleman say as to that?

Mr. SWING. All the water in both Inyo and Mono Counties will be needed by the city of Los Angeles, and that will only be half enough, in our opinion, because they are going to the Colorado River in addition to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition if there is no member of the committee in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for one hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in justice to myself and members of the committee I can not consent to the passage of this bill without calling attention to the fact that we are not in possession of sufficient facts to justify its passage. It was unfortunate for me personally that I was unable to attend the hearings yesterday because I had a hearing before another committee which I was compelled to attend and I was not able to get what might be called the evidence in opposition to this legislation. I feel I am entitled to that and I feel the committee is entitled to it. So far I have been unable to get a copy of the hearings for the reason they have not been printed, the hearings having been completed only yesterday.

I understood the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] to say that in 1913 the city of Los Angeles secured the right to build an aqueduct to this particular locality in order to obtain water for the city of Los Angeles. If the Federal Government gave that right to the city of Los Angeles, I think that any man who acquired property subsequent to that would be estopped from claiming that he had any superior water rights to that of the city of Los Angeles. If that be true, then a suit on his part or an injunction on his part, as was referred to a few moments ago by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], could not possibly lie against the city for damages arising out of that transaction. This particular reference to the hearings has not been made clear in my mind because I do not know whether it represents all the facts, and for that reason I think we should hesitate before we consent to the passage of this bill.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. It developed at the hearings that there were no water rights involved. As I understand, it is just a question of withdrawing lands.

Mr. HARE. But, as I understand, the basis for this legislation is that Los Angeles needs these lands to supply water to its people who reside in the city limits.

Mr. COLTON. As I understand, this bill does not deal with water itself only as it seeks to protect a water supply for the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman is correct in that, but if I get the facts correctly Los Angeles wants this territory in order that it might be able to supply the city with a sufficient amount of water for the residents within the incorporated part of the city. I feel there is a certain amount of merit in this proposition and justification for it. If the public lands can accommodate the city of Los Angeles with

these waters that are not needed by anybody else, then we ought to do it, but when, in 1913, the Federal Government gave Los Angeles the right to go into this valley and, you might say, appropriate, lay claim, or get title to something like 200,000 acres of land, that also carried with it the right to go into the ground to get water.

Mr. EVANS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of California. That is absolutely true; but that does not prevent those who wish to come and settle on these public lands now above that underground supply from making settlement and claiming the right to put down a well, which will involve a lawsuit, the blowing up of the aqueduct, and things of that kind. That is the very thing that has been going on, and when a man found he had no right here he would go to another place, make another entry, attempt to make another development of water, and bring on a lawsuit. In that way scores of lawsuits were filed, or claims were filed.

However, a final settlement has been reached, as the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] stated, by which the city of Los Angeles has agreed to pay cash for all these properties, with the improvements. The city has agreed to pay them the price they ask for their property and they are now perfectly satisfied with that settlement. However, here are these outlying lands that have no settlement on them, but which are potential of further settlement and further involvement in the way I have suggested.

Mr. HARE. Let me ask the gentleman this question: When the Federal Government gave the city of Los Angeles this right in 1913, could it not be anticipated then that when these wells were sunk to obtain water they would draw water from adjoining lands and that the Federal Government gave the city of Los Angeles a prior water right over or under lands contiguous thereto?

Mr. EVANS of California. Notwithstanding the recognized prior rights which may be there, these lands are still public lands and subject to entry by settlers, and when they make these entries, then further claims are made.

Mr. HARE. Then why does not the city of Los Angeles come to the Federal Government and ask that its rights within this valley be enlarged so as to take charge of these lands, because, as I see it, you are now asking the Federal Government to keep somebody else off of these lands and give the city of Los Angeles the rights and privileges which accrue therefrom without any cost.

I understand a bill has been introduced permitting the city of Los Angeles to give the Government \$1.25 an acre for these lands. I would much prefer that than to pass this bill, because that would provide an income to the Federal Government of something like \$1,000,000.

I must repeat and say that while Los Angeles may have some rights that should be protected, I am compelled to oppose this legislation to-day, because we are going into it hastily, and I can see a fundamental principle involved in it and I think it is a principle that we should guard most carefully.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. How can the withdrawal of this land from entry affect the rights of anyone who has already entered there?

Mr. HARE. It does not affect their rights, but here is the point: The city of Los Angeles then will have the right to purchase the land from any individual, as it may see fit.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. The city will have to go in and purchase the land that is withdrawn as it needs same.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. YON. Would the gentleman suggest an amendment to the bill granting the right to Los Angeles to buy all unentered land in this area?

Mr. HARE. No; not with the facts before me. As a member of the committee, I would want to know all the facts and I would want to know all the opposition before

we even considered the bill, because I can see the possibility of Los Angeles, which has a municipal water system and a municipal power plant, going ahead and extending its power operations into this section and taking the lands acquired by purchase from these individuals and building a great industry there and preventing anyone from getting adjoining lands either by conscripting it or by settling upon it or homesteading it or in any other way.

The city can go there and take the property that is purchased under existing law and exclude everybody else from the territory. It can then erect power plants and industrial enterprises and prevent competition entirely, and I do not believe the Federal Government should go ahead and acquiesce in the passage of this bill at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Does the gentleman know the location of this land?

Mr. HARE. Nobody seems to know the exact location.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will permit, in the hearings a very careful statement was made as to the location of these lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman inform me as to where they are located?

Mr. SWING. These are the outlying lands on either side of the Owens River Valley and the outlying lands around Mono Basin. All the lands that ever had any value for agricultural purposes were settled up 50 years ago. They are the so-called meadowlands, which are a narrow stretch down the valley between two high ranges of mountains, the Sierra Nevada Mountains upon the west, among whose high peaks is Mount Whitney, and the White Mountain Range upon the left which looks down into Death Valley. The land rises rather sharply from the meadowland and is simply the land through which water, when there is rain and melting snow, percolates down to the meadowland in which are located several hundred wells which the city of Los Angeles uses to augment its water supply.

The fear is that since the water is being taken out of the watershed the perfecting of filings upon this worthless agricultural land, but beneath which the water percolates down to these wells of Los Angeles, will be made the basis of harassing lawsuits, either for the purpose of collecting damages or compelling the city of Los Angeles to buy them out.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Then the gentleman can assure the House that these lands are all situated in the vicinity of Mono Basin and Owens Valley?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. And none of them is located elsewhere?

Mr. SWING. All of them are located in those two counties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five more minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Now, Mr. Chairman, another point that attracts my attention is this. I have not found any evidence yet where there is any great necessity on the part of the city of Los Angeles to have this additional water. It may exist. I am not prepared to deny that; but it has not been presented to the committee, and it has not been presented to the House. They may have an abundance of water in Los Angeles, in so far as we know.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SWING. Taxpayers are not ordinarily willing to assume voluntarily a burden of \$38,000,000 to secure an additional water supply they do not need. It is generally the compulsion and the urgency of a situation which drives a taxpayer to vote an additional burden upon himself, and in June, 1930, the city of Los Angeles burdened itself voluntarily, through its electorate, with \$38,000,000 for the purpose of completing the purchase of these lands and thereby adding to its present water supply.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate a statement of that kind from the gentleman, but he does not yet say that this bond issue of \$38,000,000 was for the sole purpose of getting water for the people of Los Angeles. It may have been, as I have already suggested, for the purpose of increasing its opportunities for establishing industrial plants or increasing its opportunities for power plants or increasing its opportunities for renting this land to individuals without any competition; I do not know.

Mr. SWING. Will the gentleman yield to me once more?

Mr. HARE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWING. I will ask the gentleman if he has read the report?

Mr. HARE. I have read the report very carefully, but I have not been able to read the testimony that was presented.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. In the interest of fairness, allow me to say—

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman will not accuse me of not being fair in the matter.

Mr. ARENTZ. I hold no brief for Los Angeles in this matter, but the towns in Owens Valley—Lone Pine, Big Pine, Independence, Bishop, and several small towns—have had their hinterland, so called, or the agricultural communities that they formerly depended upon, absolutely wiped out of existence because the water has been purchased and the land has been purchased by the city of Los Angeles.

Now, the most of this \$38,000,000 will go into and be spent in these little towns. The city of Los Angeles stepped into these little towns that I have mentioned and appraised every lot and building, and they intend to buy every structure in the town, and then the city of Los Angeles will own them. Why? Because these people claimed that they had the right to make a living, to deal with the farmers that lived on these agricultural lands which have been denuded. Los Angeles is going to do it by buying every house and every building.

Here is a valley running from Owens Lake on the south to the mouth of the canyon above Bishop, through the canyon to the valley in which Mono Lake is situated, and all tillable land in this area has been bought by the city. Every half mile for the full length of the Owens River valley below Bishop there is a pumping plant put down for some 100 miles. All of this land bought by the city not only includes the pasture but land adjacent, rocky land, which could have been used as a pasture if the hay land was used in conjunction with it.

But the bill goes beyond that; it takes the rocky land in the valley beyond that of the privately owned land on both sides of the valley between the cliffs on the west side and the steep valley sides on the east side, and hereafter people can not go in here and locate a homestead or a desert entry except outside of the limits set by this bill. And so these people say that the city of Los Angeles has taken this water away from them and has damaged them to that extent.

That is the story, and I am giving it to you in the interest of honesty, because I am a member of the Committee on the Public Lands of the House, which committee has given considerable study to this legislation; and although I hold no brief for Los Angeles, I want a square deal given to this city and at the same time protect the public interest.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman speaks convincingly, but I understand that the bonds for this \$38,000,000 have not been sold. I do not know whether that is true; there was no evidence before the committee to show that the bonds had been sold.

Mr. ARENTZ. All I know is what the gentlemen from California, Mr. EVANS and Mr. SWING, have told me, that a part of the \$38,000,000 bonds had been sold and the others were in the process of being sold. It is difficult at times to sell \$38,000,000 worth of bonds within a year after issue.

Mr. HARE. I do not see how the gentleman can give the House information as to what they will do with money next year or the year following.

Mr. ARENTZ. I will say that if the city of Los Angeles does not buy out every lot, the owners of property in the cities mentioned, in each town or village, they will not be able to proceed to develop the water, because the people are entitled to something, and I feel that these people should be bought out if they have been injured, and under the provisions of the bill and the issue of the bonds mentioned I think they will get it.

Mr. HARE. Now, I want the gentleman to get this clearly. I am not taking the position that Los Angeles should not have something if it is shown clearly that the city gets the property for the purpose of getting water. I think steps should be taken to provide for it, if the city is willing to pay for the property, but I do not think it should get the water with all these lands to the exclusion of the public, and I feel that we should consider it further.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Nevada states that under the provisions of the bill the settlers are protected. I would like to have the gentleman direct my attention to where there is a provision in the bill giving any special protection to the settlers on those lands.

Mr. ARENTZ. I want to say that I was opposed to the bill before the amendments were introduced. Those amendments, I believe, fully protect all of these settlers who have any claim whatever. Those amendments were introduced by Mr. SWING. I was opposed to the bill before they were offered, because protection was not given to the settlers.

Mr. STAFFORD. My thought is of those who are permanent residents.

Mr. SWING. The language of section 2, recommended by the committee, was drawn carefully for the purpose of protecting every man who to-day has an application on file or who has any interest, whose rights ought to be protected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there any language that places any obligation whatsoever on the municipality of Los Angeles to pay for the existing vested rights of those in the valley?

Mr. SWING. That has already been agreed to and worked out between the settlers of the valley and the city of Los Angeles. What we are concerned with now is whether or not we shall permit to go in there an immense crowd of people who will go not for the purpose of farming the land but for the purpose of farming the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is contingent upon the idea that the city of Los Angeles is going to take care of existing vested rights of those now in the valley. Where is there any action on the part of the municipality of Los Angeles by ordinance or by declaration whereby that will be confirmed?

Mr. EVANS of California. That is not a part of this bill, nor could it in any way be made a part of the bill. The city of Los Angeles has taken official action by ordinance and by resolution and in every other way that it could under the law, by the issuance of \$38,800,000 worth of bonds for that purpose, and those bonds could not be sold or used for any other purpose. It has the money in its treasury now with which to buy these lands, and is actually buying them. That has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. COLTON. We could not in this bill provide for an adjustment of the rights between the city of Los Angeles and third parties who have title to lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes. This bill is for the benefit of the city of Los Angeles, and we could provide that it should be conditional upon the purchase by that city of the rights of those in the valley.

Mr. COLTON. The committee amendment practically does that as I understand it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says that it does. Where does it even squint at it?

Mr. SWING. That is not in the bill; that is in the hearings. I examined the city officials of Los Angeles who appeared before the committee. I represent those people in the Owens River Valley and in the Mono Basin. They are my constituents, and I have had their confidence and support all of the time that I have been in Congress.

I have been in correspondence with them from the time this bill first came up. I have their letters; I have the

declaration of the Chamber of Commerce of Bishop; I have the declaration of the Chamber of Commerce of Mono and of Big Pine and of Little Pine and of Independence. They have given to me their approval of the bill I am presenting here. And unless this bill goes through, those people will lose out, because the city of Los Angeles will balk at assuming an uncertain, indefinite, and ever-increasing obligation, which will know no limit if all of these vast public lands are left open for speculators to go in and file on merely to establish a basis for a lawsuit or for a demand that whatever interest they have must be bought out.

Mr. COLTON. Further in explanation of what I said a moment ago, I had in mind the rights acquired under the public domain that have not ripened into complete title. Those are protected in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the prospectors' rights; yes.

Mr. HARE. There may be a right of those who have already settled and acquired title to their lands that would not be protected by this bill. They have the right to expect that other settlers would come into the community, that the population will increase, and that the facilities for education will grow, as also would the facilities for industry; but with the passage of this bill those opportunities, those facilities, will be forever cut off, and these men who have title to the little tracts of land will not have any equity arising out of the settlements or adjustments made by the city of Los Angeles. As a matter of fact, if these adjoining lands are withdrawn from entry, the properties owned by individuals who have already located there will decrease in value, and Los Angeles will, sooner or later, get the property for a mere song.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I confess I came into this discussion a little late, but, as I understand it, there are 376,000 acres of land in this proposed withdrawal. Has there been any proposal for the purchase of that land by the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. SWING. The proposal was made by the city of Los Angeles, but my constituents, the people who live in the Owens River Valley and in Mono Basin Valley, are violently opposed to the city of Los Angeles becoming the private owner of these lands beneath which there are valuable mineral deposits and over which there is valuable grazing land, at least in the spring of the year, and over which there are valuable hunting and fishing privileges which are attracting to that section of the country every year thousands of tourists. They do not desire this property to become the private property of the city of Los Angeles, and have violently protested against the proposal to buy it. They have insisted that the Government retain the title but are willing to go far enough to say that they do not want to see the city of Los Angeles imposed upon by speculators. They are willing that the land be withdrawn from homestead and desert land entry, which are the things which would give a right to any one to object to the withdrawal of water which percolates below the land. The answer to it is that my people in my district, in these two counties, violently object to the city purchasing and acquiring complete title to this property.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It seems to me, if I may add, that withdrawing these lands from public entry will make them practically valueless to the people who are there now, and they will have to sell out.

Mr. EVANS of California. They have already sold out.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does anybody have any idea as to the actual value of these 400,000 acres at the present time?

Mr. SWING. If the gentleman will read the report, the United States Government in 1912 picked out 66,000 of the most attractive of these public lands and offered them free to the homeless Paiute Indians for an Indian reservation. The Indians went up and took one look at it and turned around and left; and they have never been able to get a single, homeless Paiute to live upon the free offer of 66,000 acres; and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has voluntarily asked the Indian committee to pass legislation to turn that land back to the public domain as worthless for the Indian Service, and worthless for the wards of the Government.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I observed that in the report, but that does not answer the question as to what value these 400,000 acres of land may have.

Mr. SWING. They have a value for the mineral deposits under them; they have a value for grazing purposes, and they have a value for hunting and fishing. Those are reserved to the Government, and from them it is assumed the Government will derive some revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It is my understanding that a bill was introduced in Congress authorizing the sale of a tract of land in the Mono Basin and the Owens River Valley to the city of Los Angeles at \$1.25 an acre. The bill now under consideration appears to me, on the face of it, to be an effort to obtain the same advantage which would accrue through the purchase by the city of Los Angeles but at no expense to the city by reason of withdrawal from public entry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARE] has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. There is one further thing in connection with this bill about which it seems to me the committee should be informed, and that is with respect to the litigation which has heretofore existed between various communities and various people in the Mono Basin and the Owens Valley, and the city of Los Angeles. Is there in any way any association between this legislation and that litigation? Does this bill in any way relieve or attempt to relieve, directly or indirectly, the city of Los Angeles from any of the burdens of the litigation which has heretofore existed or which may now exist?

Mr. SWING. Litigation over what?

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Over the water rights in the Owens Valley.

Mr. SWING. No; the answer is it does not relieve the city of Los Angeles of any obligations, if it has any, in any lawsuit or otherwise now pending. This bill does not in any way affect water rights. It does not undertake to dispose of them. It leaves the water rights as they are, but it does undertake to control entry upon the lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. It must have an indirect effect upon the water rights—

Mr. SWING. Indirectly only.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Since it provides for the setting aside of lands which might otherwise have a water right.

Mr. SWING. The question of the use of the water that is flowing underneath this land, percolating underneath the land, as far as the possibility of using it for irrigating the land under which it percolates, is set forth fully in the report and recommendation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in asking to get rid of 66,000 acres of the best land which he now holds:

The Indians for whose benefit the withdrawal was made have not occupied or used any part of it, and no Indian is residing thereon at the present time. This is partly due to the fact that the land is rough and rocky in character, but mainly because it can not be cultivated without irrigation. The practicability of making the land susceptible of cultivation through the development of a water supply was considered. However, investigation disclosed that the cost of developing water sufficient for irrigation purposes would be prohibitive.

Therefore the water that percolates beneath the land can not at any reasonable cost be brought to the surface for use upon that land, but, percolating on lower down into the meadows where the city of Los Angeles has its wells, it can be drawn to the surface there at moderate cost and be taken in an aqueduct to Los Angeles; but if flings were allowed, that would give persons the right to object, if they wanted to, or make a claim that the percolating water underneath the land belonged to them, and object to it being drawn off. That is what we are trying to prevent.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I must admit that this legislation is new to me and I am not as well informed about it

as I should be, but in reading the report of the commissioner, in the last paragraph I note the following language:

I have been of the opinion that it would be better to withhold legislation until it was determined what particular tracts were needed by the city to protect its water supply and then deal with the matter as a whole. If, however, it is the pleasure of the Congress to proceed with the present bill, which is confined to the Owens River Valley, I see no objection thereto.

Heretofore, or as of this date, as I understand the situation, there has been no selection by the city of the definite tracts required by it to protect its watershed. Conceding for the moment the advisability of withdrawing from public entry a tract of land which will give the city of Los Angeles the same protection which it would get were it to purchase the land, conceding the advisability of adopting such a policy, the question remains, nevertheless, whether or not we should now withdraw from public entry approximately 400,000 acres of land before the city has actually determined the tracts that it will require to accomplish the end sought to be accomplished.

Mr. SWING. The answer to that is this: The very lands described in this bill are lands which have been specifically, scientifically, and carefully selected as the lands necessary for the protection of the watershed of the city of Los Angeles, and the statements of the commissioner is in error to that extent.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Then, it seems to me, the commissioner should submit another statement correcting that error before we pass upon this legislation.

Mr. SWING. These lands are what are known technically as outwash lands—that is, lands that slope toward the basin in which the wells of the city of Los Angeles are located. It was through the application of the city of Los Angeles for the executive withdrawal of these lands that the investigation was made, and they were the ones who first determined that these lands were within the area which could be used to harass them with lawsuits and claims for damages.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the reference made by the gentleman from Arizona, because I had noticed the report of the commissioner. That was one of the reasons why I was interested in seeing that we should not consider this bill at this particular time. I think I made that clear at the outset, that in justice to myself I do not feel that sufficient information and sufficient evidence has been presented to warrant the committee in taking action upon this bill to-day. I am still of the opinion that we are acting hastily upon this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserved time in opposition to this bill primarily to have a full explanation of its purport. It was only reported on yesterday. Hearings were had as recently as Saturday last. The letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office criticizing the scope of this bill was written as late as January 5, only two weeks ago.

I wish the gentlemen who are representing Los Angeles would correct me if I am in error in making this statement: The city of Los Angeles was willing to purchase these uplands, these lands for water-reservoir purposes, at \$1.25 an acre. Are these the identic lands or a part of the identic lands which some years back the municipality of Los Angeles was willing to purchase at \$1.25 an acre so as to protect its water rights?

Mr. SWING. There was a bill introduced to that effect, but an adverse report was made upon it by the Interior Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the city of Los Angeles was then willing to purchase these lands for \$1.25 an acre. How long back was it that the city of Los Angeles was willing to purchase these protective water-right lands at \$1.25 an acre?

Mr. EVANS of California. If the gentleman will permit, I will make this statement, although it is a meager statement as to information: A bill was introduced by one of the representatives of Los Angeles County to that effect, but according to my understanding no official action was ever taken by the city of Los Angeles authorizing the purchase

of such lands. As to that I have no definite knowledge, but my information is that no official action was ever taken.

Mr. STAFFORD. Taking up the question of what the municipality of Los Angeles has undertaken to do to protect the rights of the settlers in that valley, emphasis has been laid here on several occasions that the bonds issued will protect them. I questioned the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] quite at length to ascertain whether there had been any specific ordinance obligating the city of Los Angeles to indemnify them at their appraised value, but I have not as yet received any definite information as to that. As I understand the situation, these people in the meadow lands below have certain rights to have their water continued from the lands above, and if they have should we act upon merely the position of chambers of commerce in some of these settlements, which can not be considered to represent all the settlers in the meadow lands below? I think we should have some assurance, before we grant these rights, that the city of Los Angeles will agree to pay those who wish to sell a reasonable price for their lands.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is, the present value of the lands?

Mr. STAFFORD. The present value; yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, after this bill is passed and becomes a law and the Federal Government is given the right to withdraw these lands from settlement the lands which are now occupied and owned will depreciate in value.

Mr. SWING. Not at all. It will not have any such effect at all.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Why not?

Mr. SWING. Because everybody out there will know that these lands are absolutely worthless and have no potential value.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am referring to the lands that are now owned by settlers.

Mr. SWING. They already have an agreement.

Mr. EVANS of California. Those lands have been appraised, and they have issued bonds to buy them at that value.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says the lands have been appraised—appraised by whom?

Mr. EVANS of California. By both the city of Los Angeles and the people who own the lands. They have entered into an agreement as to the value of a large portion of the lands, and possibly all of them, and there is no trouble as to that. The city of Los Angeles and the owners have come to a conclusion as to the value of the lands, and the city of Los Angeles has determined the necessary amount of money it must have for that purpose. The city of Los Angeles has voted bonds and sold a part of them and actually entered into an agreement with the owners of the lands. The value of those lands will not be affected by this action at all, because it has been determined what price they will pay for those lands, not only the lands but the improvements on the lands, the buildings, and other improvements.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, those are conditions precedent to the legislation, of which the gentleman from California may be thoroughly convinced, but there is nothing in the legislation to bind anybody.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not follow the non sequitur of the gentleman from California, who says this legislation does not affect the holdings of people down in the meadow lands, and yet he says the city of Los Angeles is willing to purchase their rights.

Mr. EVANS of California. It is doing that, and will continue to do that regardless of action on this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it does not affect the value of the lands they are purchasing and if it can not possibly affect the value, why should the city of Los Angeles be willing to purchase them, if their rights are not affected by this legislation?

Mr. EVANS of California. The gentleman has not gotten the purport of this bill. It is to prevent others from going further into the mountains and into the waste lands and settling on these Government lands and establishing im-

provements and then coming back to the city of Los Angeles, as they have in the past, and saying, "Now, buy me out again."

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the only argument in favor of any meager consideration of this bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me ask the gentleman from California, Does the gentleman consider this is a perpetual withdrawal of these public lands?

Mr. EVANS of California. No; I do not.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is any term contemplated?

Mr. EVANS of California. It could be opened to public entry next year or the next day after this is passed; and there are certain uses of this land that are not withdrawn, the mineral rights, the grazing rights, and various other uses, including recreational purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona to ask a question of the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. There is nothing in this bill which limits the period of the withdrawal?

Mr. EVANS of California. Certainly not.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me call attention to the fact that the withdrawal, according to the language of the bill, is for the purpose of protecting the watershed supplying water to the city of Los Angeles, State of California, and it is to be reasonably inferred that the withdrawal will be as long as may be necessary to insure the protection of the watershed for the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. That is exactly the point I was going to make in that connection.

It strikes me that the purpose of this bill is to give the city of Los Angeles the same benefit, through withdrawal of this large acreage, that she would get were she compelled to pay the \$1.25 an acre. To the end that the city of Los Angeles purchase land, there was introduced by the Member from the city a bill authorizing the sale of this acreage of land to the city of Los Angeles at \$1.25 an acre; but because that would impose a burden of approximately \$500,000 upon the city it was elected by the Representatives of the city in Congress to obtain without cost exactly the same benefit which would accrue to her through purchase.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that the bill referred to obligating the city of Los Angeles to pay a dollar and a quarter an acre was introduced in this Congress on May 28, 1929, by the gentleman from California [Mr. CRAIL].

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COLTON. I think it can be safely said, in answer to what the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said, that the city of Los Angeles is perfectly willing even now to pay the \$1.25 an acre, but we doubt very much—I personally doubt very much—the wisdom of selling or transferring the title in fee simple to this vast tract of land to the city of Los Angeles. They could shut off grazing, they could shut off mineral development, they could stop rights of way, and stop the moving of stock from one side of the valley to the other, and this might seriously handicap the Government in the administration of the rest of the public domain in that section. I believe the committee would be opposed to the sale of the land.

Now, if I may say one word with reference to the point raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], it was brought out in the committee, and I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin also, that the committee did go into the matter of protecting the rights of owners of property. It was believed by some that this withdrawal would actually enhance values because this is not valuable as territory for prospective settlers, but, in effect, gives to those people in Owens Valley almost a monopoly on some of the resources, and, indeed, some members of the committee raised the point that it would create a monopoly and that

these people living there could enjoy all the benefits of grazing that they have heretofore enjoyed and keep other people out. So we feel that the rights of third parties are not only fully protected, but are perhaps enhanced in value by the passage of this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may state that at the beginning of consideration of this bill I was apprehensive their rates were not as secure as they would be without this bill.

Mr. EVANS of California. They are all in favor of this, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I think there is considerable force in what the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] has just said in opposition to the policy of selling this land to the city of Los Angeles. There may be great weight attached to what the gentleman has just stated to the committee.

Yet it strikes me, nevertheless; that inasmuch as the Public Land Commission is about to submit a report to the President for transmission to Congress dealing with the whole question of administration and disposition of the public domain, it may be a little hasty at this time to authorize the withdrawal of such a large tract of land prior to having received that report, because it may contain recommendations which will dispose of just such situations as this, possibly through ceding the land to the State for State control and administration or through any one of a number of different expedients.

Mr. COLTON. We will be glad to answer that in our own time, because I do not want to take all of the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am very pleased that the gentleman is so considerate.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Further, in connection with this legislation, it seems to me we should have a fair and a frank statement of the history and the present status of the litigation which has been in existence for many years, since approximately 1907, as I recall, between the residents of Owens Valley and the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. COLTON. The committee thought it had that information. Representation was made to our committee that the matter had been adjusted or was being adjusted.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Who made the representation?

Mr. COLTON. City officials of the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. But did any of the Owens Valley people make any such representation?

Mr. SWING. I speak for the people of Owens Valley, and I am authorized by them, both directly and indirectly, legally and otherwise, to speak for them, and I speak for them now.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. What was the evidence in the hearing?

Mr. COLTON. Settlement is being made by conference across the table and all the people were to be satisfied as far as it is possible. The matter is in process of adjustment and the city of Los Angeles has the money to make these purchases.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Can the gentleman from California tell the House how much water is now being developed in the Mono Basin and the Owens Valley for the city of Los Angeles?

Mr. SWING. The aqueduct is expected to carry—

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. I know that, but how much has been developed?

Mr. SWING. Somewhat less than the amount that the aqueduct was expected to carry has been developed, but in a little while we expect to add to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Then the city is now doing exactly what the gentleman from California during the consideration of the Boulder Dam bill said the city could not do. It was said then that the city could not increase the amount of water from the Mono Basin and Owens Valley, while opponents insisted that the supply of water

could be materially increased from that source. Now, the city is doing precisely what at that time it was said the city could not do.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have obtained further scientific information. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I take this opportunity to reply, in part, to the objections raised recently by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR], and possibly others, to the bill providing for establishment in Florida of the Everglades National Park. I am sure that some of my colleagues are laboring under the wrong impression as to the exact situation. The fact of the matter is that, under the provisions of this legislation, the State of Florida purports to cede to the United States Government, free of cost, some 2,000 square miles of land, or approximately 1,300,000 acres. This land, in the main, is embraced in Florida's great Everglades area. The total area of the Everglades is some 6,250 square miles of land. This land was ceded to the State of Florida under the act of Congress generally known as the swamp and overflowed lands acts, passed in 1850.

Under the terms of this act, States receiving Federal lands were to use the moneys derived from portions sold to reclaim and develop the other portions of such lands. Florida received some 20,000,000 acres of Federal lands in this manner, and has brought about marvelous improvements and development of same throughout the State of Florida. The State embraces in all some 33,000,000 acres of land.

On this 6,250 square miles of Everglades land, the State of Florida and its subdivisions have already expended about \$68,000,000. These lands have been drained, reclaimed, and developed into probably the richest and most productive lands in the world, not excepting the famous Valley of the Nile. Farms have been established, homes built, roads constructed, canals dredged; in fact, all manner of improvement has rapidly taken place in this great fertile section.

These lands are now sending hundreds of carloads of nourishing winter vegetables annually to the other States of the Union. It is also furnishing fruits and other products of almost all kinds common to tropical and semitropical lands. At the southernmost portion of this section is the area which the State of Florida purports to cede to the Federal Government for a national park. My colleagues, I dare say that some of this land is worth \$500 per acre. While portions of it have very little commercial value at this time, it occurs to me that the offer of Florida to the Federal Government is a most magnanimous one; the Federal Government in turn, of course, would preserve, develop, and care for the national park. There would be preserved nature as it is found and as it would develop for the pleasure, enjoyment, and approval of all mankind throughout the land. Flowers, trees, plants of great variety, birds, wild animals, practically all inhabitants of fresh and sea water; in fact, nature abounds there in all of its gorgeous splendor. No greater rhapsody of nature can be found anywhere than that which exists in the Florida Everglades.

The people of our Nation are entitled to share the benefits and pleasure of its wonderful natural beauty, but I shall not attempt to stress the many good reasons why the tropical Everglades Park should be established; but I do desire to say that I resent most forcefully the attack of the gentleman from Oklahoma and to suggest he undoubtedly has never been to Florida, because I can not believe that he could have observed Florida and still have the picture in his mind just suggested. The beauty and greatness in every respect of the State of Florida would have instantly faded from his mind any unpleasantness or adverse opinion.

Florida offers the greatest opportunities in almost every respect, of any State in the Union. Not only does it offer opportunity in health, contentment, and beauty, but also financially and industrially as well. Somehow, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma is himself aware of this fact. And as for the statement of my friend from New York, I deny that the Federal Government has any right to meddle

in the local tax affairs of any sovereign State. In fact, we are now experiencing entirely too much bureaucracy and Federal interference and domination in the internal affairs of State government. It is strictly the functions, prerogatives, and powers of the respective sovereign States to dictate and guide their own local tax affairs, and the Congress of the United States should not undertake by direction or indirection to withhold national legislation in retaliation for a local State tax law. The State of Florida can and will settle her own local tax affairs, and does not need, and will not accept any dictation of same from the Federal Government. Possibly the State of Florida should or should not have a State income tax law, but that is its own responsibility and its own choice, and it is not the right of the Congress to say what Florida should do in this and other local tax matters. In local tax matters my State is acting in its full right as a sovereign State, and my colleagues are well aware that these local tax matters have no bearing on this proposed legislation.

This park, when established, will be the scenic pride of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin is through, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, briefly, let me see if it is possible to clarify the purpose and intent of the bill, and the primary facts in relation to it. I think the city of Los Angeles would be ready and willing to purchase this land of the Government at a dollar and a quarter an acre, but I think it would be an unwise thing on the part of the Congress to permit the sale of this tract of land so that the city would have absolute ownership over it. There are certain public interests which ought to be safeguarded and protected in this particular area. One of these is the mining interest and the other is the grazing interest. Then, also, there is the natural attractiveness of the country. It is the last of the wild part of California and is very valuable for game and fish and for recreational purposes. The national forests come down to the edge of this withdrawn land, and over this land must go the cattle and the sheep which go in under permit of the Government to pasture in the national forest. There is some valuable pasturage, grazing on this public land, which keeps the cattle alive as they pass over it. The people in my district are unalterably opposed to either selling this or giving it to the city of Los Angeles. We want the title to remain in the United States for public purposes. There is nothing that the United States loses by this bill. If any subsequent Congress should discover, through some modern Hatfield, a way to make rainfall in what has heretofore been called Death Valley, then this land suddenly might possess some other value, and then Congress could open the land without any difficulty or make any other use of it that it saw fit. The land will remain the property of the United States, to be dealt with as the United States sees fit.

The difficulty is that a great and furious controversy has raged between the city of Los Angeles and the settlers in this valley. That controversy has now been settled by agreement. Mr. EVANS here represents the city of Los Angeles and I represent the settlers in this valley. The agreement is that the city of Los Angeles will complete the purchase of every piece of private property whose owner desires to have the city of Los Angeles buy it. A committee of 10, representing the lot and property owners in my district, of this community, met with another committee from the city of Los Angeles, and they have appraised the property. Every lot has had a picture taken of it, and has been appraised, and a description of it set down, and the city of Los Angeles has voted a bond issue and sold the bonds and has set aside certain money for the purchase of so much farm land and so much for the purchase of the city land. I am willing to express my confidence in the assertions made by the city of Los Angeles, that they intend to go through with this proposal. I think it is unfair on the part of any man here without any evidence to impugn the motives of the city in going through with this settlement

with these people in my district. If this tract is left open, then professional locators will stir up people at present unemployed and get them to settle on the land, not for any bona fide agricultural purpose, because, as declared by the General Land Office and by the Indian Office, the land is of no value for agricultural purposes. I have inspected the lands and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] has inspected the land, and we assure you that the land has no value for farming purposes at all, except, possibly, to farm the city of Los Angeles if speculators get in there; and I ask you not to be a party to a group of people who are trying to make money, not by farming the land, but by farming the city of Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no more general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

The following committee amendments were reported and agreed to:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "from," strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 5, 6, and 7 and insert in lieu thereof "settlement, location, filing, entry, or disposal under the land laws of the United States for the purpose of protecting the watershed supplying water to the city of Los Angeles, State of California, to wit:"

Page 14, line 13, strike out "and the west half southeast quarter section 9" and insert "the northwest quarter southeast quarter and south half southwest quarter southeast quarter section 19."

Page 24, line 14, after the word "Diablo," strike out "base and meridian, in California, containing approximately 182,300 acres, more or less," and insert "meridian; the south half southeast quarter, the east half southwest quarter, and the northwest quarter section 1; section 2; the west half, and the southeast quarter section 11; the north half southeast quarter, and the north half south half southeast quarter section 12; the south half south half northeast quarter, the south half northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter, the south half north half southeast quarter northeast quarter, the north half northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter, the east half southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter, the north half northeast quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, the southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and the west half southeast quarter section 13; the west half, and the south half southeast quarter section 24; all in township 2 north, range 25 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half east half, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, and the south half southwest quarter section 21; the west half, and the west half east half section 22; the east half northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter northeast quarter section 23; section 24; section 25; the southeast quarter northeast quarter, the east half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 26; the southeast quarter northeast quarter, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, the south half northwest quarter, and the south half section 27; section 34; the west half, and the west half southeast quarter section 35; all in township 3 north, range 25 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half east half, the southwest quarter southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 1; the east half southwest quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 10; the south half south half, the north half southeast quarter, and the east half northeast quarter section 11; the east half northwest quarter, the northeast quarter southwest quarter, and the east half section 12; all in township 1 south, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter northeast quarter, and the west half southeast quarter section 9; fractional east half southeast quarter section 10; fractional northwest quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 13; fractional southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter section 14; the east half east half, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 15; the northeast quarter northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 22; the west half east half section 23; the north half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the east half northwest quarter, and the east half southwest quarter section 24; the northeast quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 25; the northeast quarter northwest quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 26; the west half northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 27; the east half southeast quarter section 34; the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 35; all in township 1 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; all fractional section 2; section 3; section 4; section 5; the east half east half section 6; the north half, the north half south half, and the north half south half

south half section 7; section 8; section 9; the northwest quarter northwest quarter, the west half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 10; fractional northeast quarter southwest quarter, and fractional south half south half section 11; all fractional section 14; section 15; the north half north half, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, the northeast quarter southeast quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 17; the south half northwest quarter northeast quarter, the south half northwest quarter, the south half north half northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 18; the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 19; the north half northeast quarter section 20; all fractional section 21; all fractional section 22; all fractional section 23; all in township 2 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 1; section 2; section 3; section 4; the north half, the southwest quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 5; section 6; the east half, the northwest quarter, and the east half southwest quarter section 7; the west half, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the northwest quarter southeast quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 8; the east half, the east half west half, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 9; the north half, the southeast quarter, and the north half southwest quarter section 10; the north half, the north half south half, the southeast quarter southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 11; the north half north half, the southwest quarter northwest quarter the northwest quarter southwest quarter, the northeast quarter southeast quarter, and the south half northeast quarter section 12; the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 13; the south half, the south half north half, and the north half northwest quarter section 14; the south half, the south half north half, the northeast quarter northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 15; section 17; the east half, the west half west half, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 18; section 19; section 20; section 21; section 22; section 23; the northeast quarter southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 24; the northwest quarter northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, and the north half southwest quarter section 26; section 27; the east half, the northwest quarter, the south half southwest quarter, the south half north half southwest quarter, and the northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter section 28; the north half northeast quarter, the north half southeast quarter northeast quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter north half northeast quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter northwest quarter, the northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, the south half south half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter, the south half north half southeast quarter, the north half northwest quarter southeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter section 29; the west half, the southeast quarter, the west half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter northeast quarter, the south half northeast quarter northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 30; the east half, the northwest quarter, and the north half southwest quarter section 31; section 32; the west half, the west half east half, and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 33; the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 34; all in township 3 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 13; the west half southeast quarter section 14; all fractional section 17; all fractional section 18; section 19; the south half northwest quarter section 22; the northwest quarter section 24; the south half, the northeast quarter, the south half northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter northwest quarter section 25; the southwest quarter section 30; all in township 1 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; all fraction section 6, township 2 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half, the northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 1; section 2; section 3; section 4; section 5; section 6; the north half, and the north half southwest quarter section 7; the west half, the west half northeast quarter, the northeast quarter northeast quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 8; the east half, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, and the south half southwest quarter section 9; the north half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 10; the east half the northwest quarter, the east half southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 11; section 12; the north half, and the southwest quarter section 13; the south half northeast quarter section 14; the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 15; the northeast quarter, the north half northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 17; the north half northeast quarter section 19; the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 21; the west half, the west half northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter section 24; the north half, and the east half southeast quarter section 25; the south half northeast quarter section 26; all in township 3 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the north half section 3; the north half section 4; the north half section 5; the north half section 6; all in township 1 south, range 28

east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 1; section 2; section 3; the east half, and the southwest quarter section 4; the east half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 8; section 9; section 10; section 11; section 12; section 13; section 14; section 15; the east half, the northeast quarter northwest quarter, and the south half southwest quarter section 17; the northwest quarter section 18; the south half northeast quarter, and the south half section 19; section 20; section 21; section 22; section 23; section 24; section 25; section 26, section 27; section 28; section 29; section 30; section 31; section 32; section 33; section 34; all in township 1 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half, and the northwest quarter section 1; section 2; the west half section 3; section 4; the south half northeast quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 5; fractional northwest quarter, the south half northeast quarter, and fractional southeast quarter section 6; section 9; section 10; section 11; the east half, and the southwest quarter section 12; section 13; the southeast quarter section 14; the north half, and the southwest quarter section 15; all fractional section 21; the east half, the northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 22; section 23; section 24; the east half, the east half west half, and the west half southwest quarter section 25; section 26; the east half east half, and the west half southwest quarter section 27; the east half section 34; section 35; all in township 2 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 1; the south half section 2; the east half northeast quarter section 3; the south half south half, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 4; the south half the north half northwest quarter and the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 5; the east half, and the northwest quarter section 6; section 7; section 8; the north half north half section 9; the north half northwest quarter section 10; the east half, the southwest quarter, and the east half northwest quarter section 11; section 12; the north half, and the east half southeast quarter section 13; the northeast quarter section 14; the west half, and the south half southeast quarter section 17; section 18; the east half, and the northwest quarter section 19; the northwest quarter section 20; the southeast quarter section 21; the north half section 22; the south half section 23; the east half northeast quarter section 24; the south half section 29; section 30; section 31; the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 32; section 33; the south half, and the northwest quarter section 34; the southwest quarter section 35; all in township 3 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; fractional northwest quarter, the northwest quarter, southwest quarter, fractional east half southwest quarter, and fractional southeast quarter section 4; fractional east half, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, the south half northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter section 5; the north half, the southwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 6; section 7; the east half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the east half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter, and the northwest quarter southeast quarter section 8; all fractional section 9; all fractional section 10; fractional west half section 14; the east half, the southwest quarter, and the north half northwest quarter section 15; section 17; the east half, the southwest quarter, the south half northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 18; section 19; section 20; the west half, the northwest quarter northeast quarter, the east half southeast quarter section 21; the west half, and the north half northeast quarter section 22; the north half northwest quarter section 23; the northwest quarter, and the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 27; the northeast quarter, the north half northwest half, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, the south half south half, and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 28; the north half, the southwest quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 29; section 30; section 31; section 32; the south half, the northwest quarter, the south half northeast quarter, and the northwest quarter northeast quarter section 33; the west half southwest quarter section 34; the northeast quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 35; all in township 4 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 4; section 5; the east half section 6; section 7; section 8; the west half, and the northeast quarter section 9; the west half section 17; the north half northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, the south half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 18; section 19; section 20; the south half section 21; the south half, and the northwest quarter section 27; section 28; section 29; section 30; the west half northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, and the northwest quarter southeast quarter section 31; the north half northeast quarter, the northeast quarter northwest quarter, the east half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 32; section 33; section 34; all in township 2 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; all fractional section 4; section 5; section 6; section 7; section 8; section 9; section 17; section 18; the east half, the east half northwest quarter, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 19; section 20; section 21; section 28; the east half section 29; the east half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, and the east half section 32; section 33; all in township 3 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 21; the northeast quarter, and the east half

southeast quarter section 35; all in township 3 north, range 25 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northwest quarter southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, the southwest quarter southeast quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 24; section 25; the east half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 26; the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 34; the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the east half northwest quarter, the northeast quarter, and the south half section 35; all in township 3 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; in the north half north half, lot 2, lot 3, and the southwest quarter northwest quarter section 1; the northeast quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, lot 1 and lot 2 section 11; all fractional section 32; all in township 2 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; all fractional section 12; the southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter section 24; the north half northeast quarter section 25; all in township 1 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 7; the southeast quarter section 13; the north half, the northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, and the south half section 14; section 15; the west half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 17; the east half, lot 1 and south half lot 2 northwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 18; the south half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 19; section 20; the northeast quarter northwest quarter, the south half north half, and the south half section 21; section 22; section 23; the east half northeast quarter section 24; the west half, and the west half east half section 25; section 26; the east half, and the east half northwest quarter section 27; the west half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, and the west half southeast quarter section 28; section 29; section 30; all fractional section 31; all fractional section 32; lot 2, lot 3, lot 4 section 33; all fractional section 34; all fractional section 35; all in township 3 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1 section 19; lot 1, lot 2 section 20; the west half northwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2, lot 3 section 29; all fractional section 30; all in township 2 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; all fractional section 11; the southeast quarter, the fractional southwest quarter, the fractional northwest quarter, and the fractional west half northeast quarter section 12; the northwest quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter, the east half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, and the north half northeast quarter section 13; the northeast quarter, the fractional northwest quarter, the southwest quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 14; all fractional section 15; section 20; section 21; the south half, the northeast quarter, and the north half northwest quarter section 22; section 23; the southwest quarter, and the east half section 24; the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 25; the northeast quarter section 26; lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter section 30; lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 31; all in township 1 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northeast quarter southwest quarter, the north half southeast quarter, lot 1, lot 2 northeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter section 4; lot 1, lot 2 northeast quarter, and the east half lot 1 northwest quarter section 5; lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 6; the south half, the south half north half, and the north half northeast quarter section 9; the south half, the south half north half, and the north half northeast quarter section 10; the west half northwest quarter section 11; the west half southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter section 13; the south half, and the northwest quarter section 14; section 15; the northeast quarter, the north half southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter section 17; lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 18; lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 19; the southwest quarter, and the east half section 20; the west half, and the northeast quarter section 21; the south half section 22; the north half section 23; the west half, the southeast quarter, and the west half northeast quarter section 24; section 25; section 26; section 27; section 28; the north half section 29; the northwest quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 32; the northeast quarter section 34; the north half, and the southeast quarter section 35; all in township 3 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter section 1; the southeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 northeast quarter section 3; the southwest quarter, the south half southeast quarter, lot 2 northeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter section 5; lot 2 northeast quarter section 6; all fractional section 8; the northwest quarter section 12; the north half, and the southwest quarter section 14; the southeast quarter section 15; the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 22; the west half east half, the east half west half, and the west half northwest quarter section 27; all fractional section 28; the southeast quarter, the fractional southwest quarter; the southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the fractional north half northeast quarter, section 32; section 33; the west half section 34; all in township 2 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter section 4; the south half, lot 1, lot 2 northeast quarter, lot 1 and east half lot 2 northwest quarter section 5; the southeast quarter, and the fractional west half northeast quarter section 6; the east half, lot 1 and south half lot 2 northwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 7; the north half, and the west half southwest quarter section 8; the west half northwest quarter, the southeast quarter northwest quarter, and the north half southwest quarter section 17; the east half, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest

quarter section 18; the north half northeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter section 19; all in township 1 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the south half lot 2 northwest quarter section 19; the west half section 29; section 30; section 31; the west half northwest quarter section 32; all in township 3 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, lot 2 northwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2 southwest quarter section 6; all in township 2 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the west half northwest quarter section 4; the east half northeast quarter section 5; all in township 5 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter section 35, township 16 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 14, section 2, township 9 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter southeast quarter section 1, township 9 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; that portion of west half lying northeast of boundary line of Owens Lake, section 23, township 16 south, range 37 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 8, lot 9, lot 12, and lot 13, section 2, township 13 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 13; the southwest quarter northeast quarter section 24, all in township 11 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, northwest quarter, and the south half northeast quarter section 31; the southwest quarter northwest quarter, the west half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, all in township 4 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 23; the west half southwest quarter section 24; the west half northwest quarter section 25; the north half northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 26, all in township 5 south, range 32 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half northwest quarter section 9; lot 2, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 22; lot 2, the southeast quarter northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter northeast quarter section 27; lot 2, the northwest quarter, and lot 2, southwest quarter section 31; the south half southeast quarter section 3, all in township 5 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 4 township 6 south, range 31 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the west half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter northwest quarter, and the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 23, township 6 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the north half northwest quarter section 21, township 10 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the south half north half section 10, township 12 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the south half northeast quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 10, township 15 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 5; the east half lot 1, the east half lot 2, lot 6, and the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 6; the west half section 8, all in township 15 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter and the north half southeast quarter section 10; the north half northeast quarter southwest quarter, the west half northwest quarter southwest quarter, and the northeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 11, all in township 16 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter northwest quarter, the northeast quarter southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 9; the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 10; the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the west half southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 15; the east half northeast quarter and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 22; the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 30; lot 1 of section 31, all in township 16 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 17, the north half, southwest quarter, the north half southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 20; the west half, the northeast quarter northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter southeast quarter section 29; the west half and the northeast quarter northeast quarter section 32, all in township 1 south, range 31 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, lot 6, lot 7, the east half lot 8, the east half southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 4; lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, lot 8, lot 9, lot 10, and the south half section 5; section 8; the northeast quarter, the east half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter, and the south half section 9; section 17; all in township 2 south, range 31 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, lot 4, section 1, township 2 north, range 26 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 1, lot 2, section 1 township 2 north, range 27 east, Mount Diablo meridian; fractional northeast quarter southwest quarter section 6; fractional northeast quarter northeast quarter section 7; fractional east half east half section 17; fractional northeast quarter northeast quarter section 20; lot 1, section 32; all in township 2 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 16 (unsurveyed), township 1 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the north half southeast quarter section 36, township 3 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northwest quarter southeast quarter section 25; the north half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 36, all in township 5 south, range 30 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northwest quarter northwest quarter section 28, township 5 south, range 33 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the northwest quarter southwest quarter section 19, township 8 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half lot 2 northwest quarter section 4, township 9 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half east half, and the northwest quarter northeast quarter section 1 (unsurveyed); section 5 (unsurveyed); section 6 (unsurveyed); section 7 (unsurveyed); section 8 (unsurveyed);

the east half northeast quarter section 12 (unsurveyed); the north half, and the southwest quarter section 17 (unsurveyed); the north half, and the southeast quarter section 18 (unsurveyed); the southwest quarter southwest quarter section 23; all in township 10 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the west half section 19 (unsurveyed), section 30 (unsurveyed), section 31 (unsurveyed), all in township 10 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the east half southwest quarter section 12, township 11 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the south half northeast quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 8; the northeast quarter northeast quarter section 17; the east half (unsurveyed), and the northeast quarter southwest quarter section 21; the north half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter southeast quarter section 28; the northwest quarter northwest quarter, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 34, all in township 12 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 7, township 13 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 21 (unsurveyed); the north half, and the southeast quarter section 28 (unsurveyed); the southwest quarter section 34 (unsurveyed); all in township 13 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the north half southeast quarter section 36, township 14 south, range 34 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter, and the northwest quarter section 3 (unsurveyed); the northwest quarter section 10 (unsurveyed); the southwest quarter section 14 (unsurveyed); the west half section 23 (unsurveyed); the southeast quarter section 26 (unsurveyed); the north half northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter northeast quarter section 35 (unsurveyed); the west half section 36 (unsurveyed); all in township 14 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 19; section 20; section 21; section 22; section 23; section 24; the north half, the north half southwest quarter, and lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, section 25; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 6, lot 7, the south half north half, and the north half south half section 26; section 27; section 28; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, and the south half north half section 29; the north half, the northeast quarter southwest quarter, the north half southeast quarter, and lot 1 section 33; section 34; the west half northwest quarter, the southeast quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the southeast quarter southeast quarter, the west half southeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and lot 3, lot 4, section 35; the south half southwest quarter, the south half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, section 36; all in township 15 south, range 35 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 19; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the west half southeast quarter, and the west half section 20; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, lot 6, the northwest quarter northwest quarter, the east half northwest quarter, the west half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter, the east half southwest quarter, and the west half southeast quarter section 29; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, lot 6, lot 7, the northwest quarter, the north half southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, and the west half northeast quarter section 30; lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, lot 5, lot 6, lot 7, lot 8, lot 9, lot 10, the east half northeast quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 31; the southeast quarter (unsurveyed), lot 1, lot 4, lot 5, lot 6, lot 7, lot 8, lot 9, lot 11, lot 12, the southeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, the southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, the north half south half northwest quarter northwest quarter, the north half northwest quarter northwest quarter, the west half northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, the southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, the northwest quarter southwest quarter, and the north half northeast quarter section 32; all in township 15 south, range 36 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the southeast quarter section 18 (unsurveyed); the east half section 19 (unsurveyed); the northwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 29 (unsurveyed); the northeast quarter northeast quarter section 30 (unsurveyed); the northeast quarter, and the north half southeast quarter section 32 (unsurveyed); all in township 15 south, range 37 east, Mount Diablo meridian; lot 2, lot 4, the west half east half, and the west half section 1; section 2; section 3; the north half northwest quarter, the southwest quarter northwest quarter (unsurveyed), lot 7, lot 8, lot 9, lot 10, lot 11, lot 12, the north half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter northeast quarter, and the east half southeast quarter section 4; the northeast quarter section 9 (unsurveyed); the north half section 10; the north half, the south half northeast quarter southwest quarter, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, the east half southwest quarter southwest quarter, the southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter section 11; section 12; section 13; the east half, the east half northwest quarter, the east half west half northwest quarter, the northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, the south half southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter section 14; the northeast quarter section 23 (unsurveyed); lot 1, lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, the west half east half, and the northwest quarter section 24; all in township 16 south, range 35, east Mount Diablo meridian; the southwest quarter section 3 (unsurveyed); the east half, and the east half northwest quarter section 4 (unsurveyed); the north half northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, and the south half southeast quarter section 10 (unsurveyed); the north half, and the southeast quarter section 11 (unsurveyed); the west half, and the southeast quarter section 13 (unsurveyed);

the east half, and the west half west half northwest quarter section 14 (unsurveyed); the north half northeast quarter, the southwest quarter northeast quarter, the northwest quarter, the west half southeast quarter (unsurveyed), the northeast quarter southwest quarter, and the south half southwest quarter section 24; the northwest quarter northeast quarter, the south half northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and portion west half lying northeast of Owens Lake boundary section 25; the east half northeast quarter section 26; (that portion only lying northeast Owens Lake boundary) all in township 16 south, range 37 east, Mount Diablo meridian; fractional southeast quarter southeast quarter section 29, township 2 north, range 28 east, Mount Diablo meridian; section 1; the north half lot 2, lot 3, lot 4, and the southeast quarter southwest quarter section 19; all in township 3 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the west half southwest quarter section 25; the east half southeast quarter section 26; all in township 4 south, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; the south half section 36, township 6 south, range 31 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian; all in the State of California."

Page 49, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 2. That all lands withdrawn under the provisions of this act shall at all times be open to exploration, discovery, occupation, and purchase permit or lease under the mining or mineral leasing laws of the United States so far as same apply to minerals in said land, and to the acquisition of rights or easements under laws of the United States applicable for rights of way for railroads, highways, ditches, canals, electrical power plants, and transmission lines, telegraph and telephone lines, or other rights of way authorized to be granted under any of the laws of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as affecting any lawful homestead or desert-land claim heretofore initiated, or upon which any valid settlement has been made and is at the date of this act being maintained and perfected pursuant to law, but the terms of this proviso shall not continue to apply to any particular tract of land unless the entryman or settler shall continue to comply with the law under which the entry or settlement was made, and upon the extinguishment of any such claim by cancellation, relinquishment, or otherwise, this withdrawal shall immediately apply to and become effective upon such land: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as affecting the use or occupation of any of said withdrawn lands for grazing purposes."

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. In many of these pages I find the descriptions in the following form: "Southeast quarter southeast quarter"; "southeast quarter northwest quarter," without the words "of the" being inserted in the descriptions. Is that the practice in that country?

Mr. COLTON. It is in all Western States, in describing lands by legal subdivisions.

Mr. SWING. I am told by the department that it is the standard form of description to leave out the words "of the." They are understood.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. SWING. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Following the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MORTON D. HULL], take the clause on page 33, "the fractional east half northwest quarter northwest quarter; south half northwest quarter; and southwest quarter section 5." I assume that in the construction of that phraseology where it says "south half northwest quarter" it means "south half of the"?

Mr. SWING. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Those being the determining units of description?

Mr. SWING. That is the technical form of description used.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TEMPLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11969) to authorize the withdrawal of certain public lands from entry under the homestead and desert land laws of the United States for the protection of the watershed supplying water to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill withdrawing certain public lands from settlement, location, filing, entry, or disposal under the land laws of the United States for the protection of the watershed supplying water to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—MONUMENT TO MEMORY OF AUGUSTUS SAINT-GAUDENS (S. DOC. NO. 257)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read and, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize an appropriation of \$4,000 as a contribution of the United States to the construction of a monument at Saint-Gaudens, France, to the memory of August Saint-Gaudens.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1931.

LIMITATION OF MANUFACTURE OF NARCOTIC DRUGS (S. DOC. NO. 256)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President, which was read and, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize the appropriation of \$35,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the conference on the limitation of the manufacture of narcotic drugs to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 27, 1931.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 21, 1931.

SALE OF CHIPPEWA INDIAN LAND

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I call up the bill (H. R. 15590) providing for the sale of Chippewa Indian land in the State of Minnesota, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Minnesota the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35, township 143 north, range 37 west, fifth principal meridian, in the State of Minnesota, situated in the ceded portion of the White Earth Indian Reservation, upon the payment by the State of Minnesota of the sum of \$185, being the price of the land and the timber, as provided by the acts of January 14, 1889 (25 Stat. L. 642), and June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 862).

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

There is no objection to this bill, but I want to inquire why the committee did not follow the usual practice of making reference to these public acts in the code?

Mr. COLTON. My understanding is that only when the code is amended does the Ramseyer rule apply.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not referring to the Ramseyer rule at all. I am referring to the substantive portions of the bill under consideration. The bill refers to certain acts heretofore passed by Congress, giving reference to the Statutes at Large. It is customary in such instances to give reference to their position in the code also.

Mr. COLTON. That was overlooked perhaps.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of my inquiry has been accomplished. I know that in the future the committee will bear that in mind.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MOON NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands I call up the bill (H. R. 15877) to authorize exchanges of land with owners of private-land holdings within the Craters of the Moon National Monument, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to accept on behalf of the United States complete title to any or all of the following-described lands held in private ownership within the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho: Southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 22; northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, section 27; northwest quarter northwest quarter section 26, township 2 north, range 24 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, and in exchange therefor may patent not to exceed an equal value of land to be selected from the following-described tracts of reserved public land, subject to any valid and existing entries under any law: Northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 2; northwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter, southwest quarter, section 3; northeast quarter northwest quarter section 9; northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, section 10, township 1 north, range 23 east; and south half southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter, section 26; northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, south half southeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter, section 35, township 2 north, range 23 east, Boise meridian, Idaho: *Provided,* That if lands sufficient to equal the value of the lands within the monument offered in exchange are not available within the area herein described, then in addition the Secretary may patent public land in the State of Idaho, surveyed and nonmineral in character, sufficient to equal such value. Before any exchange hereunder is effected notice of the contemplated exchange, reciting the lands selected, shall be published once each week for four successive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties where the lands proposed to be selected are located.

Sec. 2. That the value of the lands within said monument offered for exchange, and the value of the lands of the United States to be selected therefor, shall be ascertained in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct; and the owners of such privately owned lands within said monument shall, before the exchange is effective, furnish the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to the patented lands offered in exchange; and lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall be and remain a part of the Craters of the Moon National Monument.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESA VERDE NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Public Lands, I call up the bill (H. R. 15876) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of protecting the scenery along the Point Lookout Road between the north boundary of the Mesa Verde National Park and this road's juncture with the Cortez-Mancos Road, the President of the United States is hereby authorized, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, to add to the said Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., by Executive proclamation a strip of land 260 feet wide along and including said Point Lookout Road, and the triangle formed by the fork in said road and such other public land along or adjacent to said road and right of way and lands as may be acquired by gift or by exchanges as hereinafter provided, which lands shall thereupon become and be a part of said park subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept donations of land or right of way, or to acquire title to any land along or adjacent to the said Point Lookout Road as may be deemed desirable by him for the protection of said road, by exchange for any unappropriated public lands within sections 29 and 32, township 36 west, range 14 west, New Mexico principal meridian, of equal value; the value of the lands offered for exchange hereunder and the value of the lands of the United States to be selected therefor shall be ascertained in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct; and the owners of lands offered to the United States pursuant hereto shall, before the exchange is effective, furnish the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to the lands offered in exchange.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire—because the report does not convey the information—as to the extent of the roadway that is purposed to be transferred to the Government; whether the real purpose of this bill is to obviate State supervision over the roadway approaching this national park?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I may say that the national park does not reach the main highway running across Colorado. In order to build the road and have it controlled by the national park they have to make connections and extend the park to where the road is.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is that distance?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. About a mile or a mile and a half, and it is only 260 feet wide. It is just a little strip of ground that the Government desires to have in order to control that road. They also desire to have sufficient land on each side, so that the road will not be disfigured by having hot-dog stands erected along it.

Mr. STAFFORD. After they get on the main highway it will be disfigured by hot-dog stands.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. They will be out of the park and they will be off on the main highway, and you can not prevent that.

Mr. STAFFORD. When I gave consideration to this bill I thought the real purpose was to have the National Government take control of this highway, which is outside of the national park.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, of course, it is.

Mr. STAFFORD. The other day we passed an omnibus bill—on which our esteemed friend Will Rogers commented—appropriating \$15,000,000 for highway development in the national parks, a part of which was to be used by the National Government in building connecting links with main highways. He very characteristically criticized the idea of Congress appropriating \$15,000,000 for public highways in the Western States and refusing to appropriate any money for food relief.

Mr. COLTON. This will give employment and thus provide food relief.

Mr. STAFFORD. The States have unlimited funds under that omnibus bill, in which we appropriated \$15,000,000 to provide connecting links between main highways and the national parks.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Perhaps the gentleman does not understand the situation. The National Park Service wants to have the State of Colorado and the county give up to the United States this mile of road from the main road to the park. The county has agreed to do so and the State has agreed to do so. Then the United States wants 160 feet more and it has gotten the owners of land alongside the road to donate it. Then the National Government wants a protective area on the outside for the purposes of pro-

tecting the scenic approach to this park. The information is that the consent of the county is the offers of donation that have been obtained. And at the present time the National Government, through its National Park Service wants to pay \$300 a year, which is the present estimated cost or the maintenance charge of this mile of road.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the real purpose of it, to put upon the National Government the maintenance of this highway, a portion of which is outside of its jurisdiction.

Mr. COLTON. It is included within the park.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a little shoestring highway not included within the confines of the park.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I will agree with that statement if the gentleman will add that this is all proposed by and is at the Government's request.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the two first acts passed by the Oklahoma Legislature, now in session, one of those being concurrent resolution No. 1, which memorializes the Congress to require the farm-relief board to use the wheat now held by the board for the hungry, starving, destitute men, women, and children of the United States, and the second being a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to enact a tariff on oil and its refined products and to provide further relief for the oil industry. I ask unanimous consent to extend them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, one of which memorializes the Congress to require the Farm Board to use the wheat now held by the board for the relief of the hungry and destitute in the United States, and the other memorializes the Congress to enact a tariff on oil and its refined products and to provide further relief for the oil industry.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, R. A. Sneed, secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of enrolled House Concurrent Resolution No. 1, by Gray, McDougal, and Logan, of the house, and Jennings, of the senate.

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to require the Farm Relief Board to use the wheat now held by the board for the hungry, starving, and destitute men, women, and children of the United States.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the 9th day of January, 1931.

Adopted by the senate this the 13th day of January, 1931, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of State.

Done at the city of Oklahoma City, this 16th day of January, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.]

R. A. SNEED,
Secretary of State.

WM. LEE ROBERTS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

ENROLLED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1, BY GRAY, M'DOUGAL, AND LOGAN, OF THE HOUSE, AND JENNINGS, OF THE SENATE

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to require the Farm Relief Board to use the wheat now held by the board for the hungry, starving, and destitute men, women, and children of the United States.

Whereas the United States Farm Relief Board has purchased and now holds about 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, which was purchased with public funds of the United States Government; and

Whereas it is well known that there are several million people in the United States who are out of employment and in want of the actual necessities of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein), That the Federal Congress be, and is hereby, requested to pass such legislation as is necessary to authorize and direct the Federal Farm Relief Board to have so much of the wheat now owned and controlled by that board which has been purchased with Government funds, as may be found necessary for the purpose, to be ground into flour and distributed to the hungry and starving men, women, and children of the United States.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the two United States Senators from Oklahoma and to each of the Oklahoma Members of the United States House of Representatives.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the 9th day of January, 1931.

CARLTON WEAVERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate this the 13th day of January, 1931.

ROBERT BURNS,
President of the Senate.

Correctly enrolled.

JOE M. WHITAKER,
Chairman of the Committee
on Enrolling and Engrossing.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, R. A. Sneed, secretary of state of the State of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of enrolled House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, by Logan.

A resolution memorializing Congress to enact a tariff on oil and its refined products and to provide further relief for the oil industry.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the 9th day of January, 1931.

Adopted by the senate this the 13th day of January, 1931, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of State. Done at the city of Oklahoma City this 15th day of January, A. D. 1931.

[SEAL.]

R. A. SNEED,
Secretary of State.

WM. LEE ROBERTS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

ENROLLED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2, BY LOGAN

A resolution memorializing Congress to enact a tariff on oil and its refined products and to provide further relief for the oil industry.

Whereas business of practically every kind, not only in the State of Oklahoma but throughout the entire country, has been directly affected by the depressed condition of the oil industry, and especially during recent months; and

Whereas the unrestrained and excessive importation of foreign oils is the principal cause of the industry's present plight, especially in the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas it is estimated that in Oklahoma in 1930 the total income from the production of crude oil was at least \$50,000,000 lower than it would have been under a proper oil tariff; and

Whereas the annual royalty income, the bulk of which is paid to the farmers, is reduced in Oklahoma by several million dollars; and

Whereas Oklahoma's gross production tax from 1930 operations will be lowered at least \$2,000,000; and

Whereas banking, transportation, manufacturing, and practically every other type of business has been adversely affected by the present depressed condition of the oil industry; and

Whereas the general unemployment situation has been very materially aggravated by the thousands of oil-field and oil-office workers turned out of employment because of this glutting of our markets by cheaply produced foreign oils, imported duty free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to afford relief to the distressed oil industry, and through that great industry to the Nation generally, by immediately placing an embargo on imported petroleum and its refined products, and follow this action by an adequate protective tariff on said commodities and by applying such further legislative relief as is necessary and proper; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of the other oil-producing States, with the request that they transmit similar memorials to Congress and that copies be transmitted to the United States Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Oklahoma.

Adopted by the house of representatives this the 9th day of January, 1931.

CARLTON WEAVERS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate this the 13th day of January, 1931.

ROBERT BURNS,
President of the Senate.

Correctly enrolled.

LUTHER E. GREEN,
Vice Chairman of the Committee
on Enrolling and Engrossing.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN THE CHACO CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT, N. MEX.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Public Lands, I call up the bill (H. R. 10576) to authorize exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex., and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as is Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of eliminating private holdings of land within the Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex., is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to obtain for the United States the complete title to any or all alienated lands within the boundaries of the Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex., as now or as may be hereafter defined, by accepting from the owners of such alienated lands complete relinquishment thereof and by granting and patenting to the owners, in exchange therefor, in each instance, like public lands of equal quality and acreage or of equal value as may be agreed upon situated elsewhere in the State of New Mexico, after due notice of the proposed exchange has been given by publication for not less than 30 days in the counties where the lands proposed to be exchanged or taken in exchange are located: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, on application or otherwise, designate public lands subject to exchange under this act which are, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of character similar to the alienated lands offered in exchange: *And provided further*, That any owner of patented lands in the monument now owning other lands adjoining said monument, which may be separated by the acquisition of land in the monument by the United States under the provisions hereof, shall be, and is hereby, authorized to drive stock across said monument at an accessible location, which may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, which right shall also accrue to any successor in interest to said adjoining lands, or to any lessee of such lands.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "in each instance, like" and insert the words "surveyed, nonmineral, and unreserved."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "supply" insert the words "are not embraced in a valid claim."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the word "character" and insert the word "quality."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the value of all patented lands within said monument offered for exchange, and the value of the lands of the United States to be given in exchange therefor, shall be ascertained in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct; and the owners of such alienated lands within said monument shall, before any exchange is effective, furnish the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to the patented lands offered in exchange; and lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall be and remain a part of the Chaco Canyon National Monument.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, after line 11, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. That in the acquisition on behalf of the United States under authority of law of any of the following-described land, to wit: Section 13, in township 21 north, range 11 west; section 17, in township 21 north, range 10 west; section 21, in township 21 north, range 10 west; section 3, in township 21 north, range 11 west; and section 11, in township 21 north, range 11 west, owned by the University of New Mexico, the Museum of New Mexico, and/or the School of American Research, and said Secretary may accept title thereto subject to such reservations by the grantor or grantors as will enable the said University of New Mexico, the Museum of New Mexico, and/or the School of American Research to continue scientific research thereon: *Provided*, That such use shall not interfere with the administration of said area for national-monument purposes: *And provided further*, That upon relinquishment to the United States of any of the rights reserved by any grantor pursuant hereto the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, grant the right to said University of New Mexico, the Museum of New Mexico, and/or the School of American Research similar rights with reference to other ruins and locations within said monument in lieu thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES IN CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I call up the bill (H. R. 15258) to permit the development of certain valuable mineral resources in certain lands of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill should be considered in committee, and I object.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 15258, with Mr. TEMPLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill allowing the prospecting for gold on 40 acres in range 82, township 43, in Wyoming. At the present time this land is covered by an oil and gas prospecting permit which has been extended until 1932 to prospect for oil and gas, and if oil and gas are discovered in that time they get a lease for a period of 20 years. It is exclusively for oil and gas, but we find that some years ago a group of prospectors under the placer mining law spent valuable time and money in trying to locate gold. This law allows them to prospect on 40 acres, both for gold and for oil and gas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all valuable mineral deposits except oil, oil shale, gas, phosphate, sodium, and coal, in the southeast quarter section 4, township 43 north, range 82 west, sixth principal meridian, in the State of Wyoming, which lands belong to the United States, are hereby declared to be free and open to exploration and purchase under the terms and conditions of the act approved May 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 91), while embraced in and during the period of any permit or permits to prospect for oil or gas which has been or which may be issued by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of the act approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or as extended under the acts approved January 11, 1922 (42 Stat. 356), April 5, 1926 (44 Stat. 236), March 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 252), and January 23, 1930 (46 Stat. 58), or any of them, or while embraced in and during the period of any lease or leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior following any discovery of oil or gas in said lands, except that in issuing a patent to said lands or any part thereof, to any person or corporation making a valid location thereon under the authority of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reserve to the United States the oil and gas therein and the right to mine and remove the same, provided that the lands conveyed or any part thereof shall be embraced in a valid permit to prospect for oil or gas or a valid lease to mine and remove the same at the time the patent is issued.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "17 Stat. 91" and insert "U. S. R. S., title 32, ch. 6; U. S. C., title 30, ch. 2."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Page 2, line 18, after the word "same," insert the words "or is classified as valuable for oil or gas."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That any person or corporation going upon said lands or any part thereof, by authority of this act, shall not unduly obstruct or interfere with the lawful activities of any person or corporation in prospecting for or in mining and removing oil or gas under the authority of any valid permit or lease as heretofore described which has been or which may be issued by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the commencement of exploration activities under

the authority of this act. In the event of such alleged undue interference, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the conditions under which the several persons or corporations shall jointly possess said lands in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 29 of the said act approved February 25, 1920, which provides for joint possession of lands belonging to the United States by persons or corporations prospecting for or engaged in mining and removing oil, oil shale, gas, phosphate, sodium, and coal, under the authority of that act, and/or joint possession, by persons exploring for or mining and removing these respective minerals and persons claiming the right of possession of the surface.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 20, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That any location made or patent issued pursuant to the provisions hereof shall be subject to the right of any permittee or lessee, under any permit or lease which has been, or may hereafter be, granted, where the right of such permittee or lessee was initiated prior to such location, to use so much of the surface of the land as may be necessary for prospecting for, mining, and removing the oil and gas deposits therein without compensation to the locator or patentee, in accordance with section 29 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TEMPLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15258, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF ASPHALT, GILSONITE, ELATERITE, AND OTHER LIKE SUBSTANCES ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee, I call up the bill (H. R. 14248) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 14248, with Mr. TEMPLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. DYER. This is a very short bill and a very important one, and I would like to have Members know what it is about, and therefore I object to the request.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to any qualified applicant a prospecting permit which shall give the exclusive right to prospect for asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances in lands belonging to the United States, including lands in the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and not known to be valuable for such deposits, for a period of not exceeding two years: *Provided*, That the area to be included in such a permit shall not exceed 640 acres of land.

SEC. 2. That upon showing to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that valuable deposits of any of the minerals enumerated in this act have been discovered by the permittee within the area covered by his permit, and that such land is val-

uable therefor, the permittee shall be entitled to a lease for any or all of the legal subdivisions embraced in the prospecting permit, on which such discovery has been made, such lease to be taken by legal subdivisions of the public-land surveys, or if the land be not surveyed, by survey executed at the cost of the permittee, in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. That lands known to contain valuable deposits enumerated in this act and not covered by permits or leases shall be held subject to lease by the Secretary of the Interior through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other method as he may by general regulations adopt, and in such areas as he shall fix, not exceeding 640 acres. All leases issued under this act shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, not less than 50 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds of marketable product, and the payment in advance of a rental of 50 cents per acre for each calendar year or fraction thereof. Leases shall be for a period of 20 years, with preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the expiration of such periods, and issued upon such conditions not inconsistent herewith as may be incorporated in each lease or prescribed by general regulations theretofore adopted by the Secretary of the Interior, including covenants relative to mining methods, waste, period of preliminary development, initial investment, and minimum production, and shall be subject to such modifications and amendments as to area as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be to the advantage of the United States and of the lessee.

Sec. 4. That the general provisions of sections 1 and 26 to 38, inclusive, of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," shall apply to permits and leases under this act, the first and thirty-seventh sections thereof being amended to include deposits of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances, and section 27 being amended so as to provide that no person, association, or corporation shall at one time take or hold permits and leases aggregating more than 640 acres under this Act in any one State.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 19, after the comma, insert the following: "U. S. C., title 30, sec. 181)."

Page 4, line 3, strike out the words "any one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "the."

Page 4, line 3, strike out the period and the words "of Utah."

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is a simple proposition. The former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation was located in Uintah County, my home county, Utah. When that reservation was opened, and even prior to its opening, it was discovered that there were certain deposits of gilsonite and asphalt in this area. After the reservation was opened Congress provided that the even sections could be sold to the highest bidder. That was done and these lands passed into private ownership. They are now owned by a few companies operating in that section.

I may say for the information of the House that there are large deposits of asphalt in other parts of the United States, particularly in Colorado and New Mexico, but these lands in Utah are nearer transportation and are of a better grade and there is a demand for the opening of the remainder of the land.

When I first came to Congress I thought I would try to have them opened under the old law of location—that is, the mining laws—but the department was against that as it is sometimes fraught with danger and sometimes brings about disagreeable situations resulting in lawsuits.

The Government now is committed largely in dealing with this class of minerals to the leasing policy, and this will open up the land in the odd-numbered sections in the former Uncompahgre Reservation under the leasing act.

Much of the land bearing asphalt in the other States is open under the general mining laws, the placer laws, and other mining laws, and this particular tract of land has been withheld for the further action of Congress.

It simply will open up these lands for leasing if demands for leases are made. My home county is a small county, comparatively poor so far as assessable property is concerned, and it is hoped by some of the people of the county that the opening up of these mines might possibly add to the assessable property of the county.

I do not see how any objection can be made. I am told that there are some objections by the companies that have

practically a monopoly of the gilsonite, but they have not been made to me. This will create little, if any, competition. I am not criticizing these companies. They are large taxpayers in my county and furnish much employment.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. In section 4 of the bill there is reference to section 37 of the leasing act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), so as to make section 37 applicable to these lands containing gilsonite, elaterite, and asphalt. Is the language of section 4 broad enough so that the exception in section 37 of the leasing act is also made applicable—so that all present existing private rights in lands initiated under the mining law and which are covered by this bill are excepted and would not apply to these lands?

Mr. COLTON. It is so intended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why have these lands not been opened?

Mr. COLTON. They never have been opened to entry; they were a part of the Indian reservation, and when the lands were opened the mineral was withheld. An act of Congress later was passed validating certain claims made on the lands prior to the opening of the reservation, and those lands have passed to title. Then the Congress provided that the lands in the even sections should be sold at public auction and that was done, but the odd sections have never been opened to location or entry or sale. It is a little bit difficult to say. These veins cut the land for miles through the country. They are true fissure veins, and wherever they have been worked there seems to be an almost inexhaustible supply farther down; they do not work them down to the bottom of the vein, so to speak. In my judgment it was a mistake to reserve the lands as they were reserved. I believe that it would have been better to have opened them under the leasing act in the beginning, but that is water that has gone over the wheel. There is an area perhaps of 20 miles in one direction and probably 40 miles in another where these veins are found intermittently.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman tell the House the difference between asphaltum and gilsonite?

Mr. COLTON. They are practically the same, except that the people apply the term "gilsonite" to the higher grade of asphaltum. It is rather a pure form of asphaltum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are these deposits in fluid or solid form?

Mr. COLTON. Solid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is rather the petrified condition of what originally were petroleum deposits?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. It has worked its way up from below through the fissure vein.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I understood the gentleman to say that the even sections of this former reservation have been sold to private owners?

Mr. COLTON. That is true.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Is there any mining of gilsonite now carried on on the even veins of this reserve?

Mr. COLTON. There is. A few companies operate these lands. The lands have all fallen into the hands of practically two or three companies, whose headquarters are at St. Louis. There are one or two other companies that have a small area which they work.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. In other words, private parties are mining on this ex-reserve on the even sections, and the gentleman feels that the Government should have the right to lease its lands and have its lands mined also.

Mr. COLTON. That is it exactly.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Who fixes the royalties?

Mr. COLTON. The Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What is his standard of determination?

Mr. COLTON. The bill provides the minimum of royalties that he may charge. I think he has not yet fixed any

charges for this class of lands, so I have nothing by which I could judge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I still do not understand whether these Government lands on the odd-numbered sections have been withdrawn from entry or are still an Indian reservation.

Mr. COLTON. They are public lands that have never been restored by act of Congress to entry under the mining laws.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. But were a former Indian reservation.

Mr. COLTON. Yes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for one hour in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to disabuse the minds of Members of the House as well as the mind of the chairman of the Public Lands Committee, for whom I have very great regard, as well as the members of the Public Lands Committee, of the idea of my having any interest in this legislation from the standpoint of the public. I have been in Congress for some years and this legislation has been before Congress since 1916 to my personal knowledge. It has passed this House upon two occasions, but has not received favorable consideration in the other body.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there in the interest of accuracy?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. A bill to place these lands under the leasing act has not been before Congress since 1916. That was a bill to open the land for entry and sale.

Mr. DYER. The same practice is involved, so far as I am concerned with reference to conserving gilsonite for the benefit of the people of this country for use in case of war. Some four years ago this bill was up last in this House. I called attention then to a letter that I had received from a gentleman in my city, Mr. S. P. Barron, president of the Utah Gilsonite Co., whose offices are in my city, although I do not know him personally, and have never met him. He wrote me a letter in 1926, in which he said:

It has been called to my attention that a bill has been introduced by Representative COLTON, of Utah, providing for the leasing of the gilsonite-bearing lands under the general provisions of the leasing act. I am fully acquainted with conditions regarding these lands in the State of Utah and feel under all the circumstances that this bill would be the best solution of a problem that has been rather difficult to understand. The Government has withheld from the sale or entry of these lands the odd sections of all the territory having this mineral within them. The Department of the Interior vigorously opposed the opening of these lands under any other conditions than by leasing. It, therefore, means that this great reserve will remain untouched indefinitely.

He goes on then and says further in his letter:

There is no danger of the supply of these minerals becoming exhausted. The three companies which now own all of the available lands have a sufficient supply to last for 500 years at the rate these minerals are now being mined. It will, therefore, be seen that no good is accomplished by a policy of conservation absolutely withdrawing them from the market. By the placing of these lands under the leasing act it will insure in the future the prevention of an absolute monopoly of these minerals. I therefore suggest that you strongly support this measure, and will appreciate any effort which you may set forth to secure its passage.

That letter is signed by the gentleman of whom I have made mention, the head of one of these gilsonite companies. You will observe that the writer of the letter favors the passage of the bill to prevent a monopoly, but he says that there are three companies now in the field and that the supply already available will last a great number of years. When I received that letter I felt it my duty to make inquiry respecting the legislation, and I did so.

I came to the conclusion that it was a dangerous thing to open up the balance of these lands for leasing purposes and thereby probably destroy the only real mines of gilsonite in the United States, those in this county in Utah.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman think, also, that it is unwise to have oil lands opened up to leasing, and other lands at the same time?

Mr. DYER. I do not, but I will say that is an entirely different proposition. There is an abundance of oil and there is only this one gilsonite spot in all the country, and that is in this county in Utah.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The geological books contain statements of other gilsonite and elaterite deposits.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman is correct, then I ask him and I ask the chairman of the committee and the Members of this House why it is necessary to come here with a bill and ask that we enact it into law, which applies to only one county in the whole United States? It does not touch any other county or any other State except this one county in Utah.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. DYER. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. The first bill which I brought in did that very thing, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from New Mexico, and other gentlemen interested, objected, and it was therefore limited to Utah, and there was probably perfectly good ground for their objections.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. As far as I know, this is the only time in the history of the country, with the exception of the railroad lands, where the Government, in allowing public lands to go into private ownership, has checker-boarded the map and taken 640-acre tracts and laid them off alternately by even sections to those to whom they were granted, keeping the odd sections for the Government, or vice versa.

Mr. DYER. Answering the interruption by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON], chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, in his statement in which he says they have confined this legislation to a county in Utah and only to that county because there were objections, let me read to you the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] during the consideration of one of these bills, a similar bill to this. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] made this statement when the bill was considered some four years ago:

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Utah has stated, so far as known at the present time, the main bodies of gilsonite throughout this country are located in the State of Utah.

And, as he said, within very small limitations.

Further the gentleman stated:

We have some of it in Colorado. I live in the adjoining county to the gentleman from Utah, and we are very close neighbors and our counties join. I think most of the gilsonite in Colorado is patented at the present time, and in view of the statement of the gentleman from Utah and my talk with him, my understanding is there is no objection to this bill being limited to the State of Utah.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado further said:

I do not like to join in the opposition to this bill, but this asphalt, and that is what it is, is of tremendous potential value, in my judgment. There is very, very little of it in the United States. Personally, I feel that the Government ought to hold the rest of it. I do not feel that title ought to pass for this very limited amount of ground. At the same time, if the gentlemen from Utah want the gilsonite in their State opened up in the manner provided in this bill, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection.

But he vigorously opposed this so-called act applying to the State of Colorado. He went on and said repeatedly that he was opposed to this legislation for the reason stated, that this gilsonite should be conserved for the benefit of the public and for the people.

Mr. Chairman, this is a valuable ore. There is no great demand at this time for the opening up of any more mines. It has been stated there are a number of companies. The gentleman from Utah says there are three companies. I have here in a pamphlet entitled "Asphalt and related bituminous products in 1926, and the mineral resources of

the United States," containing the names of six companies interested in the mining and manufacturing of gilsonite.

Let me make you a connected statement upon this subject for your information, because I realize that unless you have gone into this matter yourself you would not know the importance of it or the necessity of defeating this measure.

Four years ago, when this matter was being considered, I had a letter from the Secretary of War protesting against the enactment of this legislation for the reason, he said, it ought to be conserved because it was of great use in time of war.

When the Government opened the gilsonite lands, about 1893, the Secretary of the Interior determined the lands that should be sold and at the same time set aside other mining claims and reserved same for the Government.

In other words, they opened up and sold some of them, but reserved the balance for the benefit of the Government.

There is no railroad, I take it from my information, and, if I am incorrect the gentleman from Utah can correct me, there is no railroad within some 30 miles of these claims that are referred to in this bill.

There is no complaint from anybody. There is no complaint from the trade that they are charged exorbitant prices.

There are six companies actively engaged in mining and selling gilsonite. The profits are not large. There is no complaint from the trade on account of high prices. The competition is keen and there is no purpose in opening up and giving away the Government's valuable claims which it wisely reserved for emergencies.

A mining claim is 3,000 feet long and 1,500 feet wide and contains an area of 20 acres. This bill provides:

That not to exceed 640 acres of land may be located, held, applied for by, or patented to any one individual or corporation under the provisions of this act.

I, myself, personally feel that this bill ought not to pass. For instance, gentlemen, it provides that a mining claim 3,000 feet long and 1,500 feet wide and containing an area of 20 acres, should be opened up and permitted to be leased by one single person.

If you take a strip of land 1,500 feet wide and extend it along a gilsonite mining lode until a strip 15,000 feet wide contains an aggregate of 640 acres, you will find you will have a very large portion of the present Government gilsonite mining claims absorbed by one party.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. I yield.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does the gentleman not know that his proposal is absolutely impossible under the mining laws and under the public lands law? Does the gentleman not know that these lands must be taken up according to the subdivisions of the United States, and that the smallest area is a square rectangle containing 10 acres?

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is a very diligent Member and I am sure he has read the bill.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Certainly I have read the bill, but there is nothing like that in the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman said 15,000 feet.

Mr. DYER. I meant 1,500, of course.

Mr. COLTON. There is nothing like that in this bill.

Mr. DYER. Six hundred and forty acres would cover what I have referred to.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. May I be permitted to say further that there is nothing in this bill to apply these lands to the ordinary mining location of 1,500 feet in length and 150, 300, or 600 feet in width. That applies to the ordinary lode mining claim. The statement was made that these lands could be taken up under the placer act, which provides a different way altogether of taking up land.

Mr. DYER. I am just reading from the bill. I am not an expert on lands like the gentleman from Colorado, who comes from a State that is greatly interested. However, the bill provides in section 1 that the amount of land which can be taken under lease or permit shall not exceed 640 acres.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. That is correct; but that is not 15,000 feet or 1,500 feet, or anything to which those figures would apply.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman from Utah that I can not understand the object of taking away this gilsonite land, this part that has been reserved for the Government, especially when there is no demand for additional gilsonite, where there is no monopoly, when no unreasonable price is being charged, and when there is no complaint from anybody. I can not understand the reason for this bill. Some one has said it would bring additional taxes to this country; but, Mr. Chairman, no additional taxes will be produced unless a greater amount of gilsonite is mined and sold than is now being mined and sold by the six companies operating in this field. So that, in my judgment, can not be considered any argument.

I want to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the value fixed upon these lands. I was in Congress some years ago when this matter came up in the House, and the question was asked as to the value of these lands. I was told that a 20-acre piece was worth some \$25,000. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 12, 1916, Mr. Ferris, of Oklahoma, asked this question of the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Mays:

Is it not a fact that some of these claims are worth \$20,000 for a 20-acre tract—20-acre tracts, 1,500 feet long and 600 feet wide?

Mr. MAYS. Yes. Members of the company came before the committee and said that the company would give \$25,000 each for such gilsonite tracts, 20-acre tracts, 1,500 feet long and 600 feet wide. The product is easily mined and is sold without treatment at from \$25 to \$30 per ton.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to the reason why these minerals were not included in the original mineral leasing law?

Mr. COLTON. If I may be permitted, I can answer that question.

Mr. DYER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. COLTON. Gilsonite and asphaltum lands were not included in the provisions of the leasing act. Certain definite minerals were named, but gilsonite and asphaltum were not among them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am seeking information as to the reason why they were not, because at that time we were trying to establish a policy, under the leadership of Mr. Scott Ferris, who was then the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, as to the disposition of all these mineral deposits. We were trying to depart from the original policy of allowing anyone to secure an absolute right to mineral lands, but to require future entrymen to take out a permit in the form of a lease and pay a certain royalty to the Government. My query is: Can the gentleman give any information as to why asphaltum and gilsonite should not have been included in the same general law?

Mr. COLTON. I was not in the House at that time and I do not know why they were not included.

Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that in the proclamation issued by President Roosevelt in June, 1906, it was very distinctly and clearly stated that certain of these lands were to be opened but that others were to be reserved for the benefit of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, gilsonite is a very rare ore. It is found to no great extent in any other part of the world, as I have stated before, except in a small area in Uintah County, Utah. Let me tell those who do not know just what gilsonite is. It is 99.4 per cent pure hydrocarbonate. In mining gilsonite the use of dynamite and gunpowder is forbidden by the laws of Utah, since gilsonite is an explosive of great power. It is mined with hand picks. The chief field of it is around Fort Duchesne and north of the White River, in Uintah County, Utah. The nearest railroad is 25 miles distant. It is mined, sacked, and shipped to paint and varnish makers on the Atlantic seaboard, Chicago,

Philadelphia, Cleveland, and some parts of Europe. It sells on the market for about \$30 per ton. It is shipped in its raw state, it not being necessary to do anything whatever with it to make it marketable. The market demands appear still to be confined largely to the making of particular kinds of paints and varnishes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to whether the use of gilsonite has not been extended to other forms of manufacture?

Mr. DYER. Well, I think probably it has.

Mr. STAFFORD. Large quantities of gilsonite, to my certain knowledge, are being used in the manufacture of battery boxes. If the gentleman will permit, in years back, only 10 years back, the battery manufacturers utilized wooden boxes with hard-rubber cells; then a few years back, about five years ago, industry began the manufacture of reclaimed-rubber boxes. That box has been superseded, because of its expense, by what is known as the gilsonite box. I will not take the time of the gentleman, because I know his time is limited, to explain the manufacture of the gilsonite battery box, which sells on the market, in large quantities, for something like 30 cents a box. A large manufacturer in Chicago, Mr. Richardson, is manufacturing 10,000 a day and selling them to all battery manufacturers. That is the reason why the price of battery boxes has come down so materially.

Mr. DYER. I will say it is considered very important by the Government in time of war. Let me read you a letter from the Secretary of War, written when this bill was up for consideration four years ago. He says, writing to me:

With reference to your letter of March 26, 1926, and previous correspondence, upon the subject of H. R. 5885, I am pleased to inform you that the War Department is in need of a substitute for shellac and enamel. Pending the results of an investigation now under way to determine the value of these products in national defense, the War Department considers it would be most inadvisable to enact the proposed legislation into law. If, in the judgment of Congress, it is necessary to immediately dispose of this legislation it is recommended that the following amendment be incorporated:

In line 7, page 1, after the word "in," the words "the public"; and after that insert the word "public" and the following provision: "That nothing herein contained shall be held to prevent the President of the United States from reserving for military purposes any lands within the public domain known to contain asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances."

Mr. Chairman, there is no demand for this legislation in my judgment from anybody or for any public use. In other words, we are legislating, if we pass this bill, for one county only. It does not affect any other portion of the United States except this one county in Utah.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and every other man in this House coming from States that are supposed to have this product in any appreciable amount, are objecting to their States being put in the bill. They do not want it, and I would like for the gentleman from Utah, for whom I have the greatest regard, and I know would not favor any legislation for any reason other than what he considers to be the best interests of the public, to tell me why there is any need for this legislation.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Certainly.

Mr. COLTON. I will be pleased to do that in my time, but the gentleman understands that the asphaltum in these other States is now open to entry, so that the objection that those gentlemen have to including their land in this bill is not in the interest of conserving the asphaltum in those States.

Mr. DYER. Oh, yes; I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] who is here on the floor and whom I have taken the liberty to quote, when this matter was under consideration four years ago, said that he did not favor the policy; that if Utah wanted it he would not object, but, as a matter of policy, he was opposed to it.

Mr. COLTON. That is, the policy of putting these lands under the leasing act, but you may still enter lands upon the public domain that contain asphalt.

Mr. DYER. Another thing is you are practically giving these lands away, when I have called your attention to the fact that there is great value attached to them. Twenty-five thousand dollars was considered a fair offer for 20 acres, and here you are offering to give away 640 acres for 50 cents an acre.

This House has considered this legislation for a number of years and my attention was called to it by a letter from a man connected with one of these gilsonite companies in my home city. When I investigated it, after reading his letter, it seemed very clear to me that he was asking me to do something that would help him to grab up through his company the rest of the gilsonite lands that are available in this county in Utah, and I think that is what will be done if you enact this legislation. You are not going to find citizens rushing to take leases upon these lands when they have no railroad by which to get the gilsonite to the market if they find any. The result is the leases are going to be taken up by individuals or by corporations, three or four of them, and they will be turned over to these monopolistic companies who will then have an entire monopoly upon the only gilsonite, so far as I know, in the United States; and if we should become engaged in a war and should need gilsonite for explosives or for national defense, we will then be at the mercy of these monopolies.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that they should be reserved for public use. The gentleman from Utah has stated that he will explain in what way this will benefit the public, so I will yield the floor to him and reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall only take a few moments to reply to the talk made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

The gentleman has referred to the then Secretary of War, and I want to read one paragraph from a speech by the chairman of this committee when this bill was up for consideration before:

Now, it is singular and surprising that the Secretary of War, whose duty it is to send his communications to the proper House committees, communicates with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER]. I am not surprised that the Secretary of War would oppose the bill when it seems that the only information that he has comes from the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. DYER]. In his letter to Mr. DYER he states:

"With reference to your letter of March 26 and previous correspondence on the subject"—

Apparently the only information he has as to the merits or demerits of this bill comes from the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. DYER].

The bill before the House in 1916 which Mr. Mays was discussing and to which reference has been made was not this bill at all. That was a bill providing for the sale of these lands.

They were discussing an entirely different bill. There is plenty of this mineral. The supply is almost unlimited. There is enough to pave a street to the moon and back in my own county. A company has built into that section a railroad. I have nothing to say against them, I have not a word of criticism, but they are now objecting to anyone else getting hold of any other land under the terms of the leasing act.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What interests me mostly is the statement that has been made on the floor as to the value of this land. I want to ask if the bill proposes to sell these lands at 50 cents an acre?

Mr. COLTON. No. I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri did not intend to mislead the committee. The 50 cents is a charge for the use of the surface. But for all the minerals mined they pay a royalty which is fixed by the

Secretary of the Interior. And no one will be allowed more than 640 acres of land in any one lease.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Did not we have this bill up two years ago and did it not have formidable opposition from St. Louis?

Mr. COLTON. That is true.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. What became of it?

Mr. COLTON. It passed the House too late to be passed by the Senate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Why did it take so long before it came back for passage?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It was only opposed by St. Louis interests.

Mr. DYER. I think the gentleman from New York is unfair to inject remarks of that kind—if the gentleman had been here and heard my remarks.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman is within his rights to stand up for St. Louis interests.

Mr. DYER. I stated why I was opposing it; I had a letter from the Gilsonite Co. to do something in this respect. The gentleman did not come in and hear my opening statement.

Mr. COLTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. This bill is in the interest of the public. It provides that other people may obtain some of this land and we have limited the amount that they may get to 640 acres. The bill has been carefully prepared and will prevent the acquiring of more than 640 acres by one person or corporation.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

Mr. COLE. We do not know anything about this mineral in Iowa but we do know a good deal about corn and corn sugar. The gentleman says that there is plenty of this material in these lands?

Mr. COLTON. Yes; the supply is practically unlimited.

Mr. COLE. For what purpose is it used?

Mr. COLTON. It is used mostly for the manufacture of paints and varnishes and roofing.

It is used, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, for the manufacture of certain battery boxes and is also used for the manufacture of phonographic records and a number of other things.

Mr. COLE. Do they use it for explosives?

Mr. COLTON. Not to any great extent. It is not a practical explosive although the dust is explosive, as are other dusts from carboniferous ores.

Mr. COLE. Is it true that this material is found only in one county in the gentleman's State?

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no; it is found in Colorado and in New Mexico, but it just happens that this particular land was in an Indian reservation that was not open to entry at the time other lands were opened.

Mr. COLE. Is there any danger of a monopoly or a scarcity of this material?

Mr. COLTON. No; unless a monopoly exists to-day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman acquaint the House as to the extent of the deposits of gilsonite throughout the country? I know there is some in California, and in some of the other Western States. Where there are deposits, are there any on the public domain?

Mr. COLTON. I think so; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under what provisions of law could they be operated?

Mr. COLTON. Where they are not withdrawn, they could be located under the provisions of the general mining laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. And that would allow a settler to take as many as 2,240 acres?

Mr. COLTON. Oh, no; that is under the leasing act. The lode claim law provides for a claim 1,500 feet long and 600 feet wide, comprising about 20 acres, and if they are taken under the placer-mining claim they could be taken under 20-acre tracts or more.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that before we adopted the leasing policy it was possible for a coal prospector to get any number of rights up to 2,240 acres or more.

Mr. COLTON. That was done under a plan whereby entrymen would use the names of other entrymen.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was the total acreage that was possible by that method of entry?

Mr. COLTON. There was no limit. You could take whatever you could locate.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE] the gentleman states clearly that this mineral is now practically monopolized.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; in this section; because it is more easily mined there than almost any other place.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. This would open up sources of supply and would bring more of the product into the market and break the existing monopoly?

Mr. COLTON. We hope it will have that effect.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Do I understand the bill is made to apply solely to lands in the State of Utah?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Would the gentleman accept an amendment on the first page to confine it to the State of Utah?

Mr. COLTON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Would it be agreeable in the fourth section where reference is made to the leasing act of February 25, 1920, to amend so as to include also the present existing amendments to the leasing act?

Mr. COLTON. I see no objection to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman's committee considered extending the provisions of the leasing act as far as gilsonite, asphaltum, and like materials are concerned to the entire country, so far as the public domain is concerned?

Mr. COLTON. Under the former chairman of the committee that was considered at one time, but there was objection from other States, and I did not press the bill. So it was considered, but not by this committee since I have been chairman.

Mr. DYER. Would the gentleman object to this proviso to the bill:

That nothing herein contained shall be held to prevent the President of the United States from reserving for military purposes any lands within the public domain known to contain asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. That would defeat the purposes of the bill. The President has that power now.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. The proposed amendment deals with public lands, and this bill deals with a little piece of land in an open Indian reservation.

Mr. COLTON. That is true. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON].

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I happened to step out to-day for a moment when a bill in which I was interested was to be called up. The author of the bill agreed to its being laid aside for to-day, in view of the fact that a filibuster was being carried on against it.

Mr. ARENTZ. Is it not a fact that conditions beyond the gentleman's control prevented him from bringing about the passage of the bill?

Mr. YON. Yes. I want to make this statement for the benefit of those who are here and so that my people can understand and the country at large will know that Florida has a proposition that is worthy.

We are offering the United States Government something for the enjoyment of the people of the United States at no cost whatever. The hearings before the committee disclosed that it was an area of unusual potentialities for the purposes for which it was intended to be used, and I thank the members of the Committee on the Public Lands for their patience and for the time given in the consideration of this measure in the hearings and otherwise. I also want to express appreciation to the witnesses—men of note, scientists, not from Florida or the South altogether but from Washington, east and north of here—who recommended this

legislation for the reason that it will fill in in the public park plan of this country as no other area would at this time.

There might have been some remarks made to-day that were not justified in connection with this project, and for that reason let me say to the membership of this House that I resent any implications against the good intentions of the committee, the good intentions of my colleagues from the State of Florida, and the good intentions of the people of my State in offering this tract of land to the United States Government for park purposes. As I have said before, the area is eminently fitted for such a resort section, and would, I believe, be the most cheaply administered of any like area in the park service that is under the park administration of this country at this time.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YON. I yield.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. May I suggest that I favored the Florida park and I represented the minority on the committee this morning in the discussion as to whether or not we should try to call up the bill. I reached the conclusion that to call up the bill to-day would defeat the passage of any other bills on the calendar of the committee, and I consented that the bill might be laid aside. I spoke for the minority members of the committee.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YON. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. And the author of the bill joined in that request.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes. She probably did not join, but agreed to it because of the pressure that was brought to bear.

Mr. YON. I would rather that would have been done than to have the bill defeated, a bill in which the members of the committee were so deeply interested. I repeat again, I appreciate the courtesy and the unanimity that was expressed by the Committee on the Public Lands in the report on this measure. I want to thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida made the statement that he had been prevented from consideration of a bill, and he is joined by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] to make it appear that here was a most meritorious bill. I did not intend to say anything about the bill.

Mr. ARENTZ. Neither did I say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] stepped into the picture.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, the gentleman from New York was in the picture. I admit it. I would have voted against it and I would have opposed it, and when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YON] takes the floor and states that the State of Florida is giving something to the United States Government and that it involves no cost, then he either does not know what is in the bill or he is making a misstatement to this House.

Mr. YON. I do not say it would not involve any expenditure of funds on the part of the Government. I do not think the RECORD will show that. I said we were giving the United States Government something over a million acres of land, and it would be administered as cheaply as any area in the Park Service.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, let us see how cheaply it could be administered. Here is a tract of land, Everglades, six months of the year under water. They propose to build these roads so that they will be amphibious, live six months under water and six months over the water. The people of that community, according to the hearings, have spent \$30,000,000 down there in these swamps, trying to drain them, and the more they pump the more water they get out of them.

The hearings will show that this water originates up in the Carolinas and comes down and strikes rock bottom and up it comes in these Everglades. If the State of Florida

wants to make a park there, there is nothing in the world to prevent making it a State park. Let us be fair about it.

They say, "We want to conserve bird life down there; we want to conserve game down there." I do not know of anything that is going to prevent the birds from going away from there. I am sure the birds will be no more attracted to that spot if we put a fence around it and say "This is a national park, birds, come on."

The whole proposition is ridiculous at this time. I submit that we had a list of bills which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] intended to call up and which he did call up, and I submit that I cooperated with the gentleman and with the committee when we gave up our fight and gave the committee an opportunity to bring up the bills that had some merit in them. I for one in this House will judge every bill on its merits, and I can not help whom it affects or what kind of an appeal is made. If I am against a bill, the whole House and the whole world will know it. I am against this bill at this time. It was no time to consider it, and I think the committee showed good legislative judgment in withdrawing the bill from consideration.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I think this park will serve a good purpose. Inasmuch as it is half wet and half dry it ought to be called "Wickersham Park."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to grant to any qualified applicant a prospecting permit which shall give the exclusive right to prospect for asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances in lands belonging to the United States, including lands in the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and not known to be valuable for such deposits, for a period of not exceeding two years: *Provided,* That the area to be included in such a permit shall not exceed 640 acres of land.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EATON of Colorado: On page 1, in line 8, after the words "United States," insert the words "in the State of Utah."

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this merely clarifies the first paragraph of the bill and limits it to lands within the State of Utah, in accordance with the committee amendment which will be offered to section 4.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I take it that under the phraseology of the bill as reported the provisions would apply to all the public lands in the United States.

Mr. COLTON. No. In section 4 of the bill, and the committee amendment makes it more clear, would limit it to the State of Utah, so that the amendment offered by my colleague from Colorado would be consistent with the bill and the committee amendment limiting it to the State of Utah. In fact, that was the intention of the author of the bill at the time it was introduced.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read it first I thought it extended to all public lands, and I was rather in sympathy with that idea, that the leasing principle should extend to all the public lands.

Mr. COLTON. I would not disagree with the gentleman in that; but this bill is intended to be limited to lands in Utah, and this amendment is consistent with section 4 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. That the general provisions of sections 1 and 26 to 38, inclusive, of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437), entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," shall apply to permits and leases under this act, the first and thirty-seventh sections thereof being amended to include deposits of asphalt,

gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances, and section 27 being amended so as to provide that no person, association, or corporation shall at one time take or hold permits and leases aggregating more than 640 acres under this act in any one State.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, in line 19, after the parenthesis, insert a comma and the following: "(U. S. C., title 30, sec. 181)."

On page 4, in line 3, after the word "in," strike out the words "any one State" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the State of Utah."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EATON of Colorado: On page 3, line 21, after the word "domain," insert "and all amendments thereto."

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is for the purpose of clarifying section 4 and making the entire leasing act as originally enacted and the amendments thereto applicable to these lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: On page 4, line 4, after the word "Utah," strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "Provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be held to prevent the President of the United States from reserving for military purposes any lands within the public domain known to contain asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances."

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment. It is not germane to this bill and it deals with the question of the public domain, while this bill deals solely with the question of certain lands in the State of Utah in a former Indian reservation.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order made by the gentleman from Montana is probably good. I did not notice that when I offered the amendment. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TEMPLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14248) to provide for the disposition of asphalt, gilsonite, elaterite, and other like substances on the public domain, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE ASHLEY NATIONAL FOREST IN THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, if the House will bear with me, I want to call up one other small bill, S. 4149, to add certain lands to the Ashley National Forest in the State of Wyoming, which, I understand, is on the Union Calendar,

and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand this is the last bill the gentleman intends to call up this evening? I wish to go into some discussion of this bill unless it is the last bill.

Mr. COLTON. There is another bill which it was hoped the House would reach.

Mr. COLLINS. Does the gentleman refer to H. R. 4021?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. I think if you are going to take up that bill we ought to have a quorum.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COLTON. I yield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, all of this is under a reservation of objection.

Mr. LEAVITT. The bill referred to has to do with the giving of concurrent jurisdiction over a road which is, in fact, a part of the highway system of the Glacier National Park, but which, because of the contour of the country, must for a number of miles run outside the park but within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation. The passage of this bill is necessary for the protection of the life and limb of the people who visit that park from every State in this Union.

The bill would simply allow concurrent jurisdiction between the Government and the State of Montana, so that the park rangers, who operate up and down that road, can police it for the safety of the people of the country visiting that park.

Mr. COLLINS. Virginia has several roads like that leading out of the city of Washington and similar bills have been objected to.

Mr. LEAVITT. It does not make any difference to me whether they have been objected to or not. There are only two or three here who object, and if they want to object to a bill of this kind and want to put in hazard the lives and limbs of the people from all over the country who visit this park, it is still my duty in the matter to try to get the bill passed regardless of such objection by two or three Members of the House. It is not in reality my bill. It is a bill that originates with the Park Service. It is a matter of necessity in protecting people who visit the Glacier Park. It is not a simple matter or one that ought to be considered lightly, and the gentlemen who object are taking the responsibility of saying that the people traveling out there shall not have the protection given to people visiting national parks elsewhere.

Mr. COLLINS. We are going to have some discussion on that bill if it is brought up and it will be necessary to have a quorum here in the event it is to be considered.

Mr. LEAVITT. Of course, that is up to the chairman of the committee. I am not personally going to take the responsibility of saying that I do not want this bill brought up just because two or three Members of the House object to it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman consent to striking out section 3?

Mr. LEAVITT. What is section 3?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is the jurisdictional question.

Mr. COLLINS. That is not the main objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is my objection to it.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the regular order. It is now 5 o'clock, and this committee has passed about as many bills as I have ever seen any committee pass in the House of Representatives in one day, and I do not

think they ought to press for the consideration of any more bills to-night.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I shall not call up any other bills to-day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to having this bill considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

An act to add certain lands to the Ashley National Forest in the State of Wyoming

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to existing valid claims, the following-described lands be, and the same are hereby, added to the Ashley National Forest in the State of Wyoming and made subject to all laws applicable to the national forests:

West half east half, west half section 4; sections 5 and 6 and that part of sections 7 and 8 not within the Ashley National Forest; west half east half, west half and lots 6, 7, and 8, section 9; west half northeast quarter and west half section 16, all in township 12 north, range 114 west, sixth principal meridian.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive; that part of sections 11 and 12 not within the existing Ashley National Forest; sections 15 to 21, inclusive; fractional sections 28, 29, and 30, all in township 12 north, range 115 west, sixth principal meridian.

Sections 1 to 29, inclusive, all in township 12 north, range 116 west, sixth principal meridian.

Sections 30, 31, and 32; west half, west half east half section 33, all in township 13 north, range 114 west, sixth principal meridian.

East half east half, west half southeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 25; south half southeast quarter section 26; sections 31, 35, and 36; west half, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter section 32; south half section 33; southwest quarter, east half northwest quarter, east half section 34, all in township 13 north, range 115 west, sixth principal meridian.

South half south half section 30; sections 31 and 36; south half, south half north half, northwest quarter northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter section 32; east half, south half southwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter section 35, all in township 13 north, range 116 west, sixth principal meridian.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word simply to ask one brief question. I understand this bill, which met with some opposition on the part of one Member of the House who is not present now, simply involves a former military reservation, and because it was a military reservation they could not include it in the national forest.

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. When the Ashley National Forest was created this land was a part of the Fort Bridger military reservation. They have abandoned the military reservation, and that has left this land unprotected. There are only about 60 sections, and originally it would have gone into the Ashley National Forest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior on this proposition?

Mr. CARTER of Wyoming. The Secretary of the Interior states that the land is more beneficial for forestry than it is for grazing.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. COLTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WORLD-WAR ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury touching a bill that was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and which I introduced in the Congress, and in this connection I would like to call attention to the last paragraph of the letter so that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the leaders on the Republican side may take note of it because it is an unusual suggestion by a department reporting on a bill. The letter states:

The problems to which it gives rise should receive the most careful consideration by the Congress.

I hope the majority leader and the Speaker and, especially, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will take note of that request.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, by including the entire letter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GARNER. Is that the same letter?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] that the gentleman from Oregon may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, may I see the letter that the gentleman proposes to extend in his remarks? I observe that this is the same letter that I got permission to extend in my remarks. I have no objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], but I would like to ask the gentleman if he will give consideration to the paragraph that I quoted a moment ago.

Mr. TILSON. I shall be very glad to give attention to any communication that the Secretary of the Treasury may make.

Mr. GARNER. The Secretary of the Treasury says that—

The problems to which it gives rise should receive the most careful consideration by the Congress.

How does the gentleman expect to give most careful consideration in this case, unless he gives a hearing on such problems before the committee?

Mr. TILSON. Fortunately, I do not have the power to give hearings.

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman be good enough to make a suggestion to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to give hearings?

Mr. TILSON. It is not necessary for me to make suggestions to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He will do his full duty.

Mr. GARNER. I see the gentleman from Oregon, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has entered the Chamber at this moment. I will say to him that I was just addressing myself to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] in connection with his request that you be given unanimous consent to extend your remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from Secretary Mellon touching a bill now pending before the Ways and Means Committee.

In that letter the Secretary suggests that the problem to which it gives rise should receive the most careful consideration by Congress. I wonder if the gentleman from Oregon will carry out that suggestion by giving us an opportunity for a hearing before the committee so that we might give careful consideration of the problem?

Mr. HAWLEY. I think the committee will give careful consideration to it. I think in a short time I will be able to answer the gentleman definitely.

Mr. GARNER. In the affirmative?

Mr. HAWLEY. Hopes are always very pleasant. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as unanimous consent has been granted by the House to the gentleman from Texas to extend his remarks by printing this same letter, it just occurs to me that it is absolutely unnecessary and a duplication to grant the additional request to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. TILSON. I think it will not be printed twice.

Mr. GARNER. There is no necessity of the letter being printed twice and I have no objection to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] extending his remarks by inserting that letter and will not do so myself, but I do wish he would follow it up to-morrow at least with a statement that he will give a hearing before the Ways and Means Committee to carry out the suggestions of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am deeply interested in the subject matter of the letter in question. I have a bill pending on the subject of the payment of the adjusted-service certificates and have looked with favor upon the Garner bill or any similar measure to give this much-needed relief. Knowing the past attitude of Secretary Mellon on soldier "bonus" legislation, I must say that any recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury would be looked upon by me with considerable suspicion. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the proposed amendment of the World War adjusted compensation act:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 19, 1931.

HON. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of recent date inclosing a copy of H. R. 15589, a bill providing for the amendment of Title V of the World War adjusted compensation act, and requesting the views of this department.

The bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to pay to any veteran to whom an adjusted-service certificate has been issued, upon application by him, the cash-surrender value of the certificate. The cash-surrender value of the certificate is defined as the amount of the adjusted-service credit of the veteran, increased by 25 per cent, plus interest at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually from the date of the certificate to a date to be determined by the administrator, which would be fixed at not more than 30 days prior to the date of the check issued to the veteran in payment.

The bill further provides that if the veteran has at any time borrowed upon the certificate and has not repaid the principal and interest, the administrator, upon request of the veteran, shall pay both principal and interest, deducting these amounts from the basic surrender value: *Provided, however*, That interest shall be computed at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually, in lieu of the rate fixed in the note or prescribed in section 502 of the World War adjusted compensation act.

The bill further provides that if interest on any loan to the veteran has been paid by him, there shall be added to the basic surrender value the amount of interest paid by the veteran to the extent that it exceeds interest on the loan computed at 4 per cent compounded annually.

I am informed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that if all holders of these certificates should avail themselves of the option provided for in the bill, the total amount that would be paid covering basic surrender value would exceed \$2,100,000,000. It is impossible to estimate the number of veterans that would avail themselves of the option, but I should point out to you that the measure is so framed as to offer an inducement to the veterans to cash in their adjusted-service certificates and so in effect destroy the endowment-insurance plan. Indeed, the bill seems designed to effect just such a purpose, since it rests on no actuarial principles and the total cash surrender value which it contemplates exceeds by over \$375,000,000 the present-day value of the certificates outstanding, and in effect would constitute a grant of this additional amount. The retirement of outstanding adjusted-service certificates would automatically defeat the purpose which, after careful and extended deliberations, these certificates were devised to serve.

Compensation was made in this form and not in a lump cash payment in order that the veteran might be given an investment the value of which would increase from year to year and be available for distribution at a time when presumably it would be most helpful, at the same time providing him fully paid life insurance during the interim period. It is not sound or equitable for the Government to invite the veterans to cash in their endowment insurance policies and so to forego the benefits of future protection.

As far as those sections of the bill are concerned, referring to the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the principal and interest of loans secured by veterans on their certificates or the repayment of interest paid in excess of 4 per cent, compounded annually, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs informs me that the administrative difficulties involved are so great as to make this task almost impossible of performance. The total

number of transactions involving interest on loans made on certificates up to date, it is estimated, exceeds 6,000,000. To make a recomputation of interest in each one of these cases would in itself constitute an extremely difficult problem. But the difficulties are further enhanced owing to the fact that numerous loans to veterans were made by banks, and many of these loans have been repaid and the notes destroyed. Even if it were determined administratively feasible to undertake this mass of recomputations, its practical effect would not be in the interests of the veterans seeking cash on their certificates, as the time it would take to accumulate the necessary data upon which to base action would constitute a major delay in the distribution of any funds to be paid. Moreover, it would seem as if this proposal involves discrimination as between the veteran who borrowed with his certificate as collateral and the veteran who borrowed on some other form of security.

Finally, I think I should point out some of the problems involved in obtaining this huge sum for distribution, and which merit serious consideration by your committee. I think it will be conceded that the \$2,000,000,000, more or less, can not be raised by taxes. The alternative is for the Government to borrow the funds. In March of this year the Treasury is faced with public-debt maturities in excess of \$1,100,000,000, calling for a large refunding operation, and within three years some eight billion of bonds, most of them bearing 4½ per cent interest rate, become callable. While the market for Government securities is at present good, it can not be taken for granted that it has the capacity to absorb an indefinite amount of these securities, particularly if the new issues are not offered in replacement of outstanding ones but have to be absorbed by way of new investment. Business recovery is in some degree at least dependent on a good market for new securities to supply the needs of various business enterprises. To the extent that funds seeking investment are diverted to the purchase of Government bonds, to that extent is the capital market depleted of funds otherwise available for industrial and other employment. I am of the opinion that the enactment of this measure would have far-reaching consequences not only in its practical destruction of the endowment-insurance plan but in its effect on the finances of the Nation and our general economic situation.

The problems to which it gives rise should receive the most careful consideration by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the readiness of the Filipinos for independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Commissioner from the Philippine Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an address delivered by myself before the Lions' Club at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 21, 1931.

The address is as follows:

Mr. President and gentlemen, you pay me a singular compliment in having me as your guest of honor for the second time within a period of scarcely a month. I do not, however, beguile myself with the thought that this is an honor which you wish to confer upon my person. I take it rather as an evidence of the deep interest of this organization, international that it is in its outlook, in Philippine affairs.

On my first appearance before you I dwelt on the economic and social phases of American-Filipino relations. This time you specifically asked me to discuss the readiness of the Philippines for independence. This I gladly do and strictly within the time allotted.

Without further preliminaries I wish to say that the Filipinos feel, think, and believe that they are more than ready for independence. America promised it and helped us in the art of self-government. Our people have long wanted it and worked for it. The time is ripe for the liberty-loving people and Government of the United States to grant it.

UNITED STAND OF FILIPINOS

In order that there may be no mistake about our position, let me emphatically state that the Filipino people are unitedly in favor of immediate and complete independence. Both political parties in our country are together on this question. All the live elements of our population sincerely and anxiously desire it. We want it with all the attendant risks and dangers. We are ready now to accept it with all the obligations and responsibilities which a free and independent existence entails.

OBJECTIVE OF AMERICA'S PHILIPPINE POLICY

Fortunately for both the Americans and the Filipinos, there need be no disagreement or debate on the supreme objective of America's policy in the Philippines. This was announced in authoritative pronouncements of American Presidents from McKinley to Coolidge. It was incorporated in the platforms of the major political parties in the United States. It was established by the legislative and executive branches of the American Gov-

ernment when the Congress approved the Philippine autonomy act in 1916, definitely making the official commitment that "it is, as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein."

REQUISITE FULFILLED

The only requisite set forth in the organic act, therefore, was the establishment of a stable government. The Filipino people gladly accepted the new test to which they were submitted. Were they successful?

They were and as early as 1920 an American President so certified it for in a message to Congress he said:

"Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf, and have thus fulfilled the conditions set by Congress, as precedent to the consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that this condition precedent having been fulfilled it is now our liberty and our duty to keep our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

With this avowal the question really should no longer be whether the people of the Philippine Islands are ready for independence, but whether the people of the United States have not been remiss in fulfilling their part of the contract.

For the purpose more of giving facts and pertinent information than of proving my thesis, I shall proceed to discuss our preparedness.

CULTURAL PREPAREDNESS

The American people have always attached great importance to education. The Filipinos likewise are passionately devoted to education. Parents make untold sacrifices to educate their children. The people realize that, unless the masses are educated, democracy can not long endure.

The Philippines has an old civilization. Before Magellan went to the islands in 1521, the inhabitants already had their alphabet and their system of writing and possessed the culture then common to that part of the Orient.

Under Spain our country received the impact of European culture. Manila to-day has the University of Santo Tomas, founded 25 years before Harvard. By the royal educational decree of 1863 a nation-wide system of public education was inaugurated. Toward the third quarter of the nineteenth century we had over 1,600 schools. At the time of the coming of Americans, in 1898, we had nearly 2,200 schools.

During the last three decades great progress was made in education. Now we have some 8,000 schools, four universities, several colleges, about 30,000 teachers, and an enrollment of about 1,300,000. There are also a number of agricultural and vocational schools.

The percentage of literacy in the Philippines is higher and better than that of Albania, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Greece, Guatemala, Guiana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Korea, Lithuania, Malay States, Mexico, Nicaragua, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Persia, Peru, Porto Rico, Portugal, Russia, Salvador, Siam, Spain, Syria, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, and various countries of Africa and Malaysia.

Over 30 per cent of our national budget each year is set aside for the support, maintenance, and improvement of education. Not a cent comes from the United States, for our civil government has been self-supporting from the beginning.

HOMOGENEITY

The Filipinos are a homogeneous people. Writers like LeRoy, Miller, and men like Schurman and Taft have testified to the "racial solidarity" and the social unity and homogeneity of our people.

There is also an essential religious homogeneity in the Philippines. According to our last official census, 4 per cent of the people are Mohammedans, 5 per cent pagans, and 91 per cent Christians. Religious freedom to us is precious and inviolate. Religious tolerance is a fact. The alleged troubles in matters of religion are mere propaganda. There is more trouble about religion and prohibition in the United States than in the Philippine Islands.

ECONOMIC READINESS

Let me now direct your attention to the material basis of Philippine life.

Those who look upon the Philippines merely as a treasure or as a dumping ground for surplus products entertain the fear that economic chaos will follow the grant of independence.

If that were true, it would be a sad reflection upon American administration of over 30 years, and every day's delay will only serve to aggravate matters.

What are the cold facts of economics?

Under the Spanish régime, which most Americans criticize, the Filipino people achieved economic progress. We are far better prepared now to overcome material difficulties and obstacles.

The years of intimate relationship between the United States and the Philippine Islands, on the whole, witnessed material advancement profitable to both countries. Our people have reaped benefits and the people of the United States have benefited in their shipping, agriculture, industry, and commerce. The trade

and commerce of this country increased by over 1,200 per cent in the Orient, and 4,000 per cent in the Philippines.

However, the uncertainty of the status of the Islands is working a havoc on Philippine economic life. It is proving very costly to business. Capital is timid and investors—Americans, foreigners, and Filipinos—are dissatisfied. All are agreed that the present situation is precarious and unsatisfactory. With the agitation to place a limitation or duty on Philippine products coming to the United States while American products of every kind and description enter the Philippine market duty-free, the people of my country now see more clearly that their economic relations with this country have an artificial basis, and that the protection of their products is in reality only incidental and accidental.

The benumbing effect of this uncertainty of our status has made itself felt in our foreign trade during the last 10 years. For the period from 1920 to 1929, inclusive, it has been virtually at a standstill as the following figures will reveal: The value of shipments from the islands to the United States in 1920 was \$105,216,263, and in 1929, \$124,465,473; to other countries in 1920, \$45,907,593, and in 1929, \$39,981,370; total in 1920, \$151,123,856, and in 1929, \$164,446,843. The total value of consignments to the islands from the United States in 1920 was \$92,289,778, and in 1929, \$92,592,959; from other countries in 1920, \$57,148,505, and in 1929, \$54,567,316; total in 1920, \$149,438,283, and in 1929, \$147,160,275. The total foreign trade of the Philippines thus in 1920 was valued at \$300,562,139, and in 1929, \$315,560,699. A slump is feared for 1930 and in 1931.

The threat of limitation or duty on Philippine products, like the sword of Damocles, continues to hang over us. Every proposal of this nature is made without a corresponding grant of similar authority to the Philippine government as long as we are dependent.

It is not commonly known here, but it is true that the Filipinos under their country's present political status do not have the instruments of their economic salvation in their hands. The real power and authority have been reserved to the Congress in matters affecting our tariff relations, our forests, our mines, and our public domains.

To be perfectly frank, it may be admitted that some economic dislocation will occur with the severance of political relations. But it will be better and easier for the Philippines to have it come now than later. It will give us an earlier start to effect the necessary adjustments. Every year of delay will only make it more difficult for us to extricate ourselves from the system into which we may be more deeply plunged.

We should not also lose sight of the fact that the Philippines is essentially an agricultural country and that our chief products are rice, corn, hemp, tobacco, coconut, and sugar. Independent, the country will produce just as much or more rice, corn, hemp, tobacco, or coconut. The product that will be affected most adversely is sugar. But it is adversely affected now, and the agitation in America against Philippine sugar will go on unabated with likelihood of increasing intensity with the years. The future of the Philippine sugar industry, as far as the American market is concerned, is at best not promising. We better have our status determined now so as to enable us to take the steps necessary to achieve economic stability and with assurance of permanency. It should not be forgotten, too, that in 1895, before the American occupation, the Philippines produced 376,000 tons of sugar and in 1928 it produced 667,000 tons. If it is borne in mind that in 1895 the primitive mills then only extracted about 50 to 56 per cent of the saccharine juice from the cane and in 1928 the modern mills extracted as high as 96 per cent, it is obvious that before we had the American market the Philippines was already producing nearly as much sugar as it did after 30 years of American rule.

The Filipinos derive inspiration from the history of America. Right after the War of Independence one of the statesmen of this country said: "At the time when our Government was organized we were without funds, though not without resources." Freed, America has become a world empire and the richest country in the world. If granted our independence to-morrow, our government will be with funds and with resources and the genius and talent of our people will be released and employed for a more systematic and more intensive development of our country's natural resources.

FINANCE—INDEBTEDNESS

The foregoing discussion leads insensibly to a consideration of related topics.

The wealth of the Philippines, real and potential, is well-nigh unlimited. It is now the home of 13,000,000 people who are not citizens of America nor citizens of a self-governing State. Independent and developed, it can comfortably be the home of 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 happy and contented citizens, sovereign masters of their own affairs.

Our government has been self-supporting from the establishment of a civil régime to the present. Our finances are sound. Our revenues have been steadily increasing. We shall continue to tax ourselves and finance our activities after the redemption of America's plighted word.

The per capita wealth is ample for our needs and the per capita indebtedness is one of the very lowest. The per capita debt of the Philippines in 1928 was only \$5.79. What was it in other countries? In Argentina it was \$98.88; Australia \$382.66; Austria, \$54.78; Belgium, \$189.41; Bolivia, \$30.31; Brazil, \$24.49; Bulgaria, \$59.30; Canada, \$241.29; Chile, \$105.84; China, \$5.35; Colombia, \$11.08; Costa Rica, \$40.63; Cuba, \$25.57; Czechoslovakia,

\$70.73; Denmark, \$89.05; Dominican Republic, \$14.67; Dutch East Indies, \$8.42; Ecuador, \$11.74; Estonia, \$26.60; Finland, \$24.56; France, \$446.77; Germany, \$16.55; Greece, \$70.25; Haiti, \$7.40; Hungary, \$22.11; India, \$11.32; Italy, \$236.72; Japan, \$45.92; Latvia, \$8.66; Lithuania, \$3.87; Mexico, \$51.72; Netherlands, \$162.94; New Zealand, \$841.39; Norway, \$156.61; Panama, \$38.59; Paraguay, \$7.83; Peru, \$20.24; Poland, \$15.27; Rumania, \$53.77; Salvador, \$14.43; Spain, \$154.87; Sweden, \$79.96; Switzerland, \$105.06; United Kingdom, \$815.19; United States, \$145.54; Uruguay, \$126.63; Venezuela, \$5.01; Yugoslavia, \$42.78.

The public debt of the Philippines has been contracted after due study of the resources of the government. It is below the limit authorized by law. Sinking funds are maintained to cover outstanding bonds. Payments of interests and amortization funds are made on or before maturity.

GOVERNMENTAL AND POLITICAL READINESS

Under this caption we shall briefly take up various aspects of Philippine life demonstrative of the people's political experience and governmental preparedness.

The Filipinos from pre-Spanish days have had a stable social organization. The family and the barangay, a larger social unit, have been the bases of our society. Upon a foundation early developed by the inhabitants, the Spanish administrators built the municipal, provincial, and central governments.

These, in turn, served as bases for later political and governmental organizations.

The Philippine Revolution of 1896 culminated in the establishment of the short-lived Philippine Republic. It was organized in accordance with a constitution devised, voted, decreed, and sanctioned by delegates who were truly representative. It was the first constitution in the Orient setting forth the principle that the people are sovereign.

The last 30 years saw a gradual evolution of the municipal, provincial, and insular governments in the islands. Soon after the enactment of the present organic act, the Philippine Legislature approved act 1407 reorganizing the executive branch of the government providing for six executive departments, to wit, the department of the interior, the department of public instruction, the department of finance, the department of justice, the department of agriculture and natural resources, and the department of commerce and communications.

The Philippines has had a bicameral legislature consisting of the senate and the house of representatives.

There is a well-organized judiciary impartial and independent. There are justice of the peace courts, courts of first instance, and a supreme court.

We have a civil service insuring the merit system in the government service.

We have the necessary machinery for public health, sanitation, and public welfare.

We have developed roads, bridges, port works, and other public improvements. To-day, there is an adequate system of communication and transportation.

We have the municipal police and the constabulary to maintain peace and order among a naturally peaceful and law-abiding people.

The whole political development has been continuous from a government of Americans during the military régime to a government of Americans assisted by Filipinos during the first part of the civil régime, then to a government of Filipinos assisted by a few Americans during the period after the approval of the Philippine autonomy act.

The next logical step is to inaugurate a government of and by Filipinos for all the inhabitants of the Philippines through the enactment of a Philippine independence legislation. This will occasion no abrupt or radical change. It is the next proper step for the people and Government of the United States to take.

INTERNATIONAL PHASES

The early grant of independence to the Philippines will constitute the crowning glory of America's Philippine experiment. It will be a great contribution to international understanding and world peace. It will be a model of sincerity in international dealings and the triumph of a new morality in colonial affairs.

It is alleged in certain quarters that an independent Philippines can not withstand aggression from without. This is true. But even now it can not do so. America, under the provisions of the treaty approved at the Washington conference and of the recent London pact, has agreed not to increase the fortifications or defense of the Philippine Islands. This can only be interpreted to mean that this Republic sincerely has committed itself to the principle of peace as an instrument of national policy and that it has faith that other signatory powers are likewise sincerely animated by a similar policy. Any other interpretation is tantamount to accusing of rank hypocrisy every country which has been a member of the League of Nations, a party to the World Court, a believer in the Kellogg-Briand pacts, or a signatory to the disarmament treaties.

Besides we ask: Is invulnerability a requisite to independence? If so, no country in the world, except possibly one or two, should be independent.

The Filipinos believe in self-determination. We believe this world is war weary. We believe peoples are more peace-minded. We have no fear. As I said at the outset, we are ready for our independence with all the risks and dangers. We are ready to accept the consequences that go with freedom. We are ready to take

the bitter with the sweet. We are ready to shoulder the duties and responsibilities which a free and independent self-governing existence entails.

THE QUESTION

The question now should be: Is America ready to fulfill her self-imposed part of the contract?

America really is on trial. An anxious Philippines, an expectant world, awaits her promptly to act.

The Filipino people believe that the solemn pledge of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and grant their independence should without avoidable delay be redeemed.

RED CROSS RELIEF WORK IN ARKANSAS

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a letter that I have just received from Mr. M. L. Sigman, chairman of the Drew County chapter of the American Red Cross, also a letter that was written by Mr. Sigman to Mr. John Barton Payne, chairman of the American Red Cross, and Mr. Payne's reply to the communication received from Mr. Sigman, showing the work of the Red Cross in Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Red Cross work in Arkansas I include in my remarks a letter just received from Mr. M. L. Sigman, chairman of the Drew County Chapter of the American National Red Cross; also a letter that was written by Mr. Sigman to Mr. John Barton Payne, chairman of the American Red Cross, headquarters Washington, D. C., and Mr. Payne's reply to communications received from Mr. Sigman showing the work of the Red Cross in Arkansas.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
DREW COUNTY CHAPTER,
Monticello, Ark., January 17, 1931.

Hon. D. D. GLOVER,
United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GLOVER: I am inclosing herewith copy of a letter received from Mr. John Barton Payne, chairman of American National Red Cross, in answer to a telegram I had previously sent him and also copy of my letter to Mr. Payne, which was written under date of January 11.

A former letter I had hurriedly written to Mr. Payne did not cover the situation and set out the facts sufficiently to be representative. In my letter of the 11th, I have undertaken to draw a more complete picture, as I see the situation, and I am passing this on to you, hoping it may be of some assistance in the work you are trying to put over.

Please be assured that I stand ready to do anything within my power to help in the situation.

With very kind regards, I am, yours very truly,

M. L. SIGMAN,
Chairman Drew County Chapter,
American National Red Cross.

JANUARY 9, 1931.

Mr. M. L. SIGMAN,
Chairman Drew County Chapter,
American National Red Cross, Monticello, Ark.

MY DEAR MR. SIGMAN: Answering your telegram, if you understood from my examination before the Appropriations Committee that I was opposed to the Caraway bill providing for food relief, you misunderstood the situation.

The Red Cross never opposes or supports legislation. I express no opinion about the Caraway bill or any other legislation. I was examined about the attitude of the Red Cross, what it was doing with reference to feeding people and what it was financially able to do. I explained at length what we had done, starting out with the seed program and later feeding those who were in need of food throughout the drought-stricken area, and then in response to the question whether we had funds sufficient I said I could not tell; that if it appeared that we were running out of funds we would make an appeal to the country for contributions for this purpose, and that no human being was able to tell how much money it would require.

My statement which offended Senator CARAWAY was that my advices from England, Ark., were that 40 people only had come into the town demanding food; while on the same day—last Saturday—500 families were provided with food by the Red Cross in a perfectly normal way. I might say for your information that the opposition as stated in the press to the Caraway bill is that it tends to establish the principle of the dole system, which is now so very embarrassing to Great Britain, but this is a question in which I am not involved.

What is your own situation? How are you getting on? I would be very glad to hear from you.

Cordially yours,

JOHN BARTON PAYNE, Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1931.

HON. JOHN BARTON PAYNE,

*Chairman The American Red Cross,
National Headquarters, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. PAYNE: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 9th, in answer to my telegram. Very glad to get your letter, for it reassures me that our organization still takes no part, either for or against, any political controversy.

I have mislaid the copy of article referred to in my telegram; however, in substance it quoted you as stating before the Appropriation Committee, when asked about food relief for the drought-stricken farmers, that "The Red Cross would be able to handle the situation, and that if funds ran short, an appeal would be made for more funds to carry on." In this connection I note in yesterday's press that the President has been requested to appeal for \$10,000,000 for relief work through our organization.

It is the general understanding down here, Mr. Payne, that the Red Cross will carry on in this relief work in a general way till March 1, at which time, with the aid of the Government, local credits will be used to finance the planting and harvesting of 1931 crop, by loaning to the needy farmers funds sufficient to take care of the situation. Due to an almost complete failure in last year's crop a majority of the farmers already owe to local banks or to furnishing merchants more than the value of their livestock and other chattels, all of which it is the common custom here to mortgage together with the crop to be grown for funds to be used in growing the crop. In fact, last year's mortgage on these chattels are still unsatisfied and the old debt against them still exists in most cases.

If it is not the intention of the Government to provide for food along with seed, feed, and fertilizer in the present relief measure, then in the event this class of farmers will be unable to carry on unless food is furnished from some other source. Since their credits are already exhausted, this coupled with the fact that the local banks and furnishing merchants are already burdened with last year's unpaid loans, and who will be unable to make additional loans to these farmers who have always depended on this source for financial assistance, this being shut off from them indeed leaves these people in a very deplorable condition.

As I understand the case, the Robinson bill at the outset provided that the Government would make loans to this class of farmers funds sufficient to make another crop, which, of course, would cover food, etc., for themselves as well as for feed, seed, etc. This bill, I understand, was defeated rather than have incorporated in it a provision taking care of the food situation. The Caraway amendment, I understand, undertakes to provide this additional relief. If loaning money in this manner to this class of borrowers is considered "dole," then the dole system has been in existence in this country as long as I can remember. I can not see myself why it would be called a dole even though the funds were being provided by the Government. A note will be given in payment for all funds received, and this note will have a first mortgage on the crop grown to secure the payment of the note.

I would like to prophesy here that in event the loans are made and we have a normal crop with normal prices 95 per cent of the loans will be paid within one year, or as soon as the crop is harvested and sold. This does not look like a dole, does it? On the other hand, if the Government does not provide these food loans, and the Red Cross or any other agency undertakes to feed these people through the year without cost, in my opinion, such a condition will be considered a dole, and the independence of these farmers will be destroyed. A direct loan will enable the farmer to keep his self-respect, purchase and pay for his needs as he requires them, all with very little cost of administration. If the Red Cross or any other agency undertakes to take care of the situation otherwise, after spring opens up and crops are started and on through the year, by free distribution of food and clothing such as will be required, the administration of such a campaign will be one of the biggest jobs ever undertaken both in time required and money to meet demands.

While there is no work to be had, account of industry being at a standstill and which normally gives these people support between crop seasons, or, in other words, a job, this coupled with the fact that those who were fortunate in being able to harvest some portion of their requirements in food products, all of which is now becoming exhausted, forces these people to apply to us for help. I believe that within the next two weeks will see at least 80 per cent of the farming class of our people without food and in dire need of assistance. Our lists are growing fast every day and the end is not yet. We are beginning to have calls for feed for livestock, although the weather has been in our favor so far. We have had very little cold weather, and the winter pastures have worked wonders. They are becoming exhausted by being overgrazed in some instances and stock is beginning to fail. So far we have furnished no feed for stock, funds not being available.

We have scoured the towns for clothing and up to now have pretty well taken care of this item; however, there are demands now being made for clothing, especially shoes, which we are now unable to supply. The unfortunates who are needing shoes, etc., and who we are feeding, I have been advised, since there was no work for them to get up their fuel in good weather sufficiently to keep the houses comfortable and so they would not have to expose themselves in extreme wet and cold weather in looking for jobs, etc.

In other words, I have advised them to take care of their health in every way possible. So far health conditions are good. I am fearful, though, due to scant clothing, a short-food ration, and

other necessities for keeping their strength, that should we have a long siege of bad cold weather, the stage would be set for a lot of pneumonia, "flu," etc. We are hoping for the best, however, and will do our best to guard against this. It would do you good to witness how cheerful and with what fortitude most of our cases seem to meet the conditions. They are patient and most all show a willingness to cooperate to the limit with us. They feel that they will be taken care of, but they are anxious to get to the point where they can take care of themselves. Their greatest worry now is wondering where and by whom they will be financed for another crop. So many bank failures over the State and surrounding country has created a situation that makes it impossible for some of those who otherwise could shift for themselves to obtain credit, and to this class it is very humiliating for them to have to ask assistance. We try to cheer them up and ask them not to feel bad about it, that better times are coming for us all.

We are using this present condition as a means to try and educate these people in the value of diversification in their farming. Trying to show them the importance of growing a living in diversifying rather than to try to make money on a 1-crop system. In the end, if the matter is handled right, I feel that this calamity will pay dividends.

I trust you will pardon this long letter, and I am sorry that I am not more able to picture this situation just as I see it. We will continue to do our best with credit to our wonderful organization. We will try to meet the conditions as they come. Our local chapter is well organized, and so far all known suffering has been handled.

With very kind regards, I am yours very truly,

M. L. SIGMAN,
Chairman Drew County Chapter American Red Cross.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The following leave of absence was granted by unanimous consent:

To Mr. PALMISANO (at the request of Mr. GAMBRILL), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. LEA, of California, temporarily, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a memorial to William Howard Taft at Manila, P. I.

ADJOURNMENT

And then, on motion of Mr. COLTON (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 22, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 22, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(2 p. m.)

To further the commerce of the United States by creating a world commerce corporation. (H. R. 14454.)

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(11 a. m.)

To provide that the United States shall cooperate with the States in promoting the general health of the rural population of the United States and the welfare and hygiene of mothers and children. (H. R. 12995.)

For the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants. (S. 255.)

COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES

(10 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to extend the provisions of certain laws to the Territory of Hawaii," approved March 10, 1924. (H. R. 16034.)

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

(10 a. m.)

To consider private bills.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of a mill to manufacture distinctive paper for United States securities. (H. R. 12308.)

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider farm loan drought bills.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

788. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of the military cemetery, island of St. Thomas, to the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, and the transfer of the King's Hill Poor Farm to the municipality of St. Croix, Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

789. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to provide for paving the Missionary Ridge Crest Road, portions of which are also known as the Crest Road and the Crest and Gap Road, from Sherman Heights at the north end of Missionary Ridge, in Tennessee, to the junctions of said road with the Chattanooga and Lafayette or State road at Rossville Gap in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BEERS: Committee on Printing. H. Con. Res. 46. A concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States (Rept. No. 2319). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Civil Service Commission (Rept. No. 2316). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WASON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 16415. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 471. A joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union; without amendment (Rept. No. 2322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STALKER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 14922. A bill to amend the acts approved March 3, 1925, and July 3, 1926, known as the District of Columbia traffic acts, etc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 16297. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 2324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 14441. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the Naval War College, Newport, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15772. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved May 10, 1928, entitled "An act to extend the period of restriction in lands of certain members of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRITTEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 15926. A bill to amend the act approved June 22, 1926, entitled "An act to amend that part of the act approved August 29, 1916, relative to retirement of captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders of the line of the Navy," as amended by the act of March 4, 1929; without amendment (Rept. No. 2328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KERR: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 14696. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey certain land to the city of Asheville, N. C., for park and street purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11418) granting a pension to Sabra Osage; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14709) granting a pension to H. M. Wright; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 16415) making appropriation for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. NEWHALL: A bill (H. R. 16416) authorizing the Dixie Bridge Co., its successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, and the Licking River at or near the junction of the Ohio and Licking Rivers to connect Cincinnati, Ohio, with Covington, Ky., and Newport, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16417) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Campus Martius Memorial Museum of the city of Marietta, Ohio, the silver service presented to the United States for the gunboat *Marietta*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMS: A bill (H. R. 16418) providing for the issuance of patents upon certain conditions to land claimed to be covered by patents from the State of Texas, and accretions thereto, and determined to be within the State of New Mexico by the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, entered April 9, 1928; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRIVER: A bill (H. R. 16419) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Madison, Ark., on State Highway No. 70; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 16420) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha,

Nebr., and at or near South Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16421) authorizing the cities of Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa, and the counties of Douglas, Nebr., and Pottawattamie, Iowa, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Missouri River at or near O'Hern Street, South Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 16422) authorizing the establishment of Boulder City town site, and necessary expenditures in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 16423) increasing the number of commanders of the line of the Navy on the active list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16424) to authorize the transfer of the Military Cemetery, Island of St. Thomas, to the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, and the transfer of the King's Hill Poor Farm to the municipality of St. Croix, Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS: A bill (H. R. 16425) for the purpose of granting construction loans to railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 16426) to amend the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16427) to amend the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 16428) to grant pensions to certain nurses who served in the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 16429) to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 16430) to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over park land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 475) to prohibit the use of the Army base, located at Fifty-eighth Street, between the river front and First Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., as quarters for prisoners; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 476) to create a joint congressional committee to be known as a committee on prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the eighteenth amendment and vesting in the Congress certain powers to regulate intoxicating beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 478) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving Congress the power to regulate the manufacture, traffic in, or transportation of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the Congress of the United States, urging the enactment of legislation permitting the United States Government to pay to counties and States taxes on Indian lands therein located; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 16431) providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Lighthouse Reservation for public use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 16432) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 16433) for the relief of James J. Scully; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 16434) granting a pension to Nancy E. Dermitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 16435) for the relief of the First National Bank of Thermopolis, Wyo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 16436) granting a pension to Gorda James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16437) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cheney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 16438) granting a pension to Edith M. Cruise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 16439) for the relief of George A. G. Dearborn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 16440) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Dodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 16441) granting an increase of pension to Annie Stevens Dyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16442) granting an increase of pension to Melinda A. Heltzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16443) granting a pension to Harriett Lounsbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16444) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16445) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16446) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16447) granting an increase of pension to Louisiana Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 16448) granting a pension to Pearl Wittenmyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 16449) granting a pension to Dora Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 16450) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Winters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 16451) granting a renewal of patent No. 40996, relating to the emblem of the Foresters of America; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 16452) granting an increase of pension to Claude E. Maxwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 16453) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 16454) for the relief of J. F. Hubbard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 16455) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe C. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16456) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 16457) granting a pension to Philip Gump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 16458) granting an increase of pension to John J. Cawley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16459) granting a pension to Catherine Boyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16460) for the relief of United States Marshal George B. McLeod; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 16461) granting a pension to Katherine Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8752. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Sherburne, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8753. By Mr. CRAWL: Petition of many citizens of Petaluma, Calif., favoring House bill 9994, for the purposes of furnishing Braille books for the adult blind; to the Committee on Education.

8754. Also, petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 7884, a bill for the exemption of dogs from vivisection; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8755. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the New York Tow Boat Exchange, submitting to Congress the necessity of early appropriation of funds to be applied to the acquirement, by purchase or construction, of such vessels and for the support of additional personnel, which in the judgment of the captain of the port is considered necessary to the effective administration of his office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8756. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of V. E. McClain and other residents of South Bend, Ind., urging the passage of an amendment to the World War adjusted compensation act, providing for immediate cash redemption of the soldiers' bonus certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8757. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., favoring enactment of legislation providing for payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8758. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of the Reynolds-Harjo Post, No. 125, of the American Legion, located at Okemah, Okla., urging passage of a bill providing for the payment in full of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8759. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Lincoln Civic Association, of Cleveland, urging the Congress of the United States to enact such laws and appropriation of funds as will prevent loss of property by its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8760. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Salamanca, Frewsburg, and Randolph, N. Y., urging the enactment of a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8761. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolution of the American Legion Auxiliary, of Waterloo, Iowa, unanimously urging that legislation be passed for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, as in the Grant-Hudson motion-picture bill [H. R. 9986], signed by the president, Emma Balensifer, and the secretary, Mrs. Arline Brees, both of Waterloo, Black Hawk County, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8762. By Mr. SANDLIN: Petition signed by ex-service men of Coushatta and Vivian, La., asking for payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8763. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of American Legion post, of Greenbush, Minn., urging passage of pending legislation for cashing of adjusted-compensation certificates at face value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8764. Also, petition of Bemidji Civic and Commerce Association, Bemidji, Minn., urging the enactment of House

bill 15600, to establish minimum levels for certain lakes in Minnesota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8765. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of the Baptist Young People's Union, of West Virginia, by Miss Lulu Meadows, president, urging that Congress enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8766. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8767. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Scottdale Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union (230 members), urging passage of Hudson bill regulating moving pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8768. Also, petition of the Westmoreland County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, requesting support of the Sparks-Capper amendment to the Constitution cutting out approximately 7,500,000 unnaturalized aliens in making new apportionment for congressional districts, and requesting support of Hudson bill (H. R. 9986) providing for Federal motion-picture commission, to assure production of pictures of higher moral tone; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8769. Also, petition of J. Howard Snyder Post, No. 781, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Irwin, Pa., requesting support of Wright-Patman bill to provide for immediate payment in full of World War veteran's adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1931

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 21, 1931)

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	Keyes	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	King	Smith
Black	George	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	McGill	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	McKellar	Stephens
Borah	Glenn	McMaster	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Gould	Morrison	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Morrow	Trammell
Bulkley	Harris	Moses	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Walcott
Connally	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hayden	Partridge	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hebert	Patterson	Waterman
Cutting	Heflin	Phipps	Watson
Davis	Johnson	Pine	Wheeler
Deneen	Jones	Pittman	Williamson
Dill	Kean	Reed	

Mr. WATSON. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. RANDELL] is absent because of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

EUGENE MEYER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will now proceed to consider the nomination of Mr. Eugene Meyer to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board.

The Senate, in executive session, proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. BROOKHART obtained the floor.